THE DISCIPLES DIVINITY HOUSE
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

HERBERT LOCKWOOD WILLETT
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
CARLI: Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois

http://www.archive.org/details/christianunionqu11unse

VOL. XI NO. 1

"God gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation."

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than of those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are friendly to all indications of Christian unity and ventures of faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour—are parts of the Church of Christ and that the unity of His disciples is the paramount issue of modern times.

JULY, 1921

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

2710 PINE STREET
ST. LOUIS, MO.

504 N. FULTON AVENUE
BALTIMORE, MD.

AGENTS:
Fleming H. Revell Company, *New York*
Maruzen Company, Ltd., *Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka* and *Sendai*
Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, *London, E. C. 4;* 100, Princes Street, *Edinburgh*

TWO DOLLARS A YEAR FIFTY CENTS A COPY

BL1

THE SPIRIT OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY

THE favorite figure in which the church of the first century set forth its conception of the Spirit of Christianity is that of "the Good Shepherd." The emblem which appears on this page is a reproduction of one of the early Christian gems.

"ONE FLOCK

ONE SHEPHERD."

"No one has written more appreciatively respecting this symbol than Dean Stanley in his *Christian Institutions*. It appealed to all his warmest sympathies. 'What,' he asks, 'is the test or sign of Christian popular belief, which in these earliest representations of Christianity is handed down to us as the most cherished, the all-sufficing, token of their creed? It is very simple, but it contains a great deal. It is a shepherd in the bloom of youth, with the crook, or a shepherd's pipe, in one hand, and on his shoulder a lamb, which he carefully carries, and holds with the other hand. We see at once who it is; we all know without being told. This, in that earliest chamber, or church of a Christian family, is the only sign of Christian life and Christian belief. But, as it is almost the only sign of Christian belief in this earliest catacomb, so it continues always the chief, always the prevailing sign, as long as those burial-places were used.'

"After alluding to the almost total neglect of this lovely symbol by the Fathers and Theologians, he says that it answers the question, what was the popular religion of the first Christians? 'It was, in one word, the religion of the Good Shepherd. The kindness, the courage, the love, the beauty, the grace, of the Good Shepherd, was to them, if we may so say, Prayer Book and Articles, Creed and Canons, all in one. They looked on that figure, and it conveyed to them all they wanted. As ages passed on, the Good Shepherd faded from the mind of the Christian world, and other emblems of the Christian faith have taken His place. Instead of the gracious and gentle Pastor, there came the Omnipotent Judge, or the crucified Sufferer or the Infant in His mother's arms, or the Master in His parting Supper, or the figures of innumerable saints and angels, or the elaborate expositions of the various forms of theological controversy.' But 'the Good Shepherd represents to us the joyful, cheerful side of Christianity of which we spoke before. . . . But that is the primitive conception of the Founder of Christianity in those earlier centuries when the first object of the Christian community was not to repel, but to include; not to condemn, but to save. The popular conception of Christ in the early church was of the strong, the joyous youth, of eternal growth, of immortal grace.'"—Frederic W. Farrar in *The Life of Christ as Represented in Art.*

1463

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

A Journal in the Interest of Reconciliation in the Divided Church of Christ. Interdenominational and International. Each Communion may speak with Freedom for itself in these Pages as to what Offering it has to bring to the Altar of Reconciliation.

Vol. XI. JULY, 1921 No. 1

CONTENTS

OPINIONS REGARDING THE ARTICLE "HAS THE DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOL A PLACE IN PRESENT DAY EDUCATION?" 9

THE DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOL—A REJOINDER 26
By Rev. H. O. Pritchard, LL. D., Secretary of Disciples Board of Education, Indianapolis, Ind.

CHRISTIAN UNITY—WHAT TO DO NEXT 33
By Rev. Rockland T. Homans, D. D., Rector Grace Episcopal Church, Jamaica, N. Y.

REUNION IN ENGLAND 44
By Rev. Alfred E. Garvie, D. D., Principal New College, University of London.

THE FREE CHURCHES AND THE LAMBETH APPEAL . . . 54

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY . 69

AMONG BOOKS AND MAGAZINES 76

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is issued in January, April, July and October. It is the servant of the whole Church, irrespective of name or creed. It offers its pages as a forum to the entire Church of Christ for a frank and courteous discussion of those problems that have to do with the healing of our unchristian divisions. Its contributors and readers are in all communions.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, $2.00 a year—fifty cents a copy. Remittance should be made by New York draft, express order or money order.

Entered as second-class matter in the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo.

CHRISTIAN UNITY CALENDAR

PENTECOST SUNDAY has been named both by the World Conference on Faith and Order and the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity as the day for special sermons on Christian unity, along with prayers to that end.

MEETING of the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order at Gardiner, Me., August 1-5, 1921. Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Me., secretary.

MEETING of the World Conference on Faith and Order. Date and place unannounced. Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Me., secretary.

MEETING of the Universal Conference of the Church of Christ on Life and Work, perhaps in 1922 or 1923. Archbishop of Uppsala, president; Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City, secretary.

CHRISTIAN UNITY PRAYER LEAGUE

(Membership in this League is open to all Christians—Eastern, Roman, Anglican and Protestant, the only requirement being a notice by post card or letter of one's desire to be so enrolled, stating the Church of which he is a member. Address, Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, Seminary House, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.)

RECONCILIATION:

But all things are of God, Who reconciled us to Himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses, and having committed unto us the word of reconciliation. We are ambassadors therefore on behalf of Christ, as though God were entreating by us: we beseech you on behalf of Christ, be ye reconciled to God.—(II Cor. 5:18-20.)

AN ACT OF DEDICATION*:

O Lord, Our Maker and Redeemer,
We turn us to Thee, who didst draw us to Thyself and make us Thine,
Blending and mingling, as water with wine, our poor lives with Thine own.
Take all we are and have, the very substance of our souls—
O set us to Thy service only!
May we no longer live and work for our own gain, apart from Thee.
We own Thy absolute authority over us, in life and in death,
And, surrendering all things else, we dedicate ourselves to Thee.

Keep what we cannot keep,
Mend what we cannot mend,
Make us what we cannot even aspire to, since our destiny is hidden from us in Thee. Amen.

---

*Adapted from Fr. Roche.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

EDITED BY PETER AINSLIE,
Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore, Md.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

RAYMOND CALKINS,
Pastor First Congregational Church, Cambridge, Mass.

J. A. CRAMER,
Minister Dutch Reformed Church, The Hague, Holland

ADOLF DEISSMAN
Professor in the University of Berlin, Germany

ALFRED E. GARVIE,
Principal of New College, University of London, London, England

HUGHELL FOSBROKE
Dean General Episcopal Theological Seminary, New York City

WILLIAM P. MERRILL
Minister Brick Presbyterian Church, New York City

GEORGE W. RICHARDS
Professor of Church History, Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, Lancaster, Pa.

WILLIAM TEMPLE
Canon of Westminster, London, England

NATHAN SÖDERBLOM,
Archbishop of Uppsala, Sweden

ALL editorial communications should be addressed to Peter Ainslie, Editor THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

SUBSCRIPTIONS may be sent direct or placed through Fleming H. Revell Company, New York City; Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai; Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, London, E. C. 4, or 100 Princes Street, Edinburgh.

SUBSCRIPTION price $2.00 a year—50 cents a copy.

CONTENTS OF

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

FOR APRIL, 1921

PRACTICAL STEPS TOWARDS CHRISTIAN RE-UNION 249

By Rev. Arthur C. Headlam, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford.

THE OUTLOOK FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY 258

By Rev. Joseph A. Vance, D.D., Minister First Presbyterian Church, Detroit, Mich.

TOWARDS CHRISTIAN UNITY 269

By Rev. Alexander Ramsay, D.D., Minister Presbyterian Church of England, Highgate, London.

THE DOGMATIC VERSUS THE EXPERIMENTAL APPROACH TO UNION 276

By Professor Alva W. Taylor, M.A., Professor of Social Service and Christian Missions in the Bible College of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.

HAS THE DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOL A PLACE IN PRESENT DAY EDUCATION? 289

By Rev. Peter Ainslie, D.D., Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore, Md.

EDITORIAL:

The St. Louis Conference 305

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY 309

LETTER TO THE EDITOR 317

AMONG NEW BOOKS 319

A PRAYER

GRANT, LORD, that we may dwell much upon thy heavenly plans and purposes of reconciliation and unity rather than upon the schismatic conditions of Thy Church, lest we become discouraged and lose faith as the world about us has done because they hear only the cry of discord and see only its manifestations. Show us Thyself and the beauty of Thyself in others until we shall think of all who pray as our brothers of the common faith, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

VOICES OF MANY CHURCHES ARE NO VOICE

CAN the Churches in America, speaking with one voice, as strong as many waters, inspire with this conviction the leaders of Christian nations? To be able to do this all the Church leaders must awaken to the apocalyptic earnestness of the present time, and must feel like soldiers in different uniforms, but of the same army, marching toward the same goal. All other aims, like increase in welfare of one's own denomination, getting money for new church buildings, proselytizing in the Church of one's neighbor, sending missions to handfuls of people in the dark corners of the globe—all these ends are trifling games of the blind who do not see their main duty in a night of earthquake. If necessary, therefore, let my denomination perish, but let Christ be the ruler of the rulers of the world.

Brethren, organize a coöperative brotherhood of Churches and then as one unit make a spiritual pressure upon the leaders of this immense country and through them upon the world. The voices of many Churches are no voice at all. One united voice of all the Churches will shake the earth. For it will not be a human voice but the voice of Pentecost.
—*Bishop Nicholai of Serbia to American Church Leaders.*

THE DISCOVERY

There is something wrong with the Church — fundamentally wrong. He who wraps himself up in the security of his own party is both deaf to the call of God and blind to the needs of the world. It is not likely that in the adjusting of the parts of the Church to each other some parts will stand inviolate while others will have to be very much broken up to make adjustment. The wrong system is so great that all the parts must undergo readjustment, some perhaps more than others. The one that yields most loves most and love is the gateway toward reconciliation—"By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another."

OPINIONS REGARDING THE ARTICLE "HAS THE DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOL A PLACE IN PRESENT DAY EDUCATION?"

THE paper recently published in these columns entitled "Has the Denominational School a Place in Present Day Education?" has called forth general comment from all classes of educators. These comments may be classified into four groups: First, those who favor the general idea of interdenominationalizing the denominational school; second, those who oppose interdenominationalizing the denominational school; third, those who both favor interdenominationalizing the denominational school and are working at it; and fourth, those who recognize the seriousness involved in our present day educational system but do not see its solution in the interdenominationalizing processes in all instances as suggested in the paper. These comments speak for themselves.

First, those who favor the general idea:

Rev. James L. Barton, secretary of American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (Congregational), Boston, Mass., writes: "I read your article with approving interest. One of the saddest conditions now handicapping the progress of the Kingdom is the way denominationalism overshadows Christianity and often crowds it to the wall. In an increasing number of instances in the foreign field different communions are uniting in college educational work, as well as in theological training. The greatest obstacle these union movements in education abroad have to encounter is the intense denominational zeal here at home. It is encouraging to see that many schools in the United States established as denominational, measured by the student body, are no longer so. I expect that the greatest obstacles to be overcome are not doctrinal differences but denominational pride. We are more eager to build up a denomination and sectarian institutions, than we are to make Christ known to the world. We pray 'Thy Kingdom come, provided it bear the label of our denomination, not otherwise.' Calmly and dispassionately considered, our denominationalism seems the most destructive and condemnatory heresy. If we will only educate our youth in the broad sense of education, we can safely trust to them the perpetuation of all the sectarianism the next generation will demand or require. The Church surely needs a new conception of Christian education. May you be instant in season and out of season in promoting this broad conception of Christianity as over against sectarianism."

Professor R. H. Jordan, Dartmouth College (Congregational), Hanover, N. H., writes: "There is no question in my mind but that the future of the Church in this country demands a more rational treatment of doc-

trinal differences. Those of us who are interested in higher education feel very keenly the unfortunate schisms that are introduced in the name of denominationalism, and especially do we deplore the unnecessary duplication of educational agencies with the resultant weakening of each. I do not at all agree with the feeling that a strict denominationalism is essential to the virility of such institutions. On the contrary, I feel that if these institutions were administered under a central board of the type you suggest, the religious life of both students and faculty would be tremendously quickened and stimulated."

Rev. A. E. Elmore, pastor Second Presbyterian Church, Chattanooga, Tenn., writes: "I believe you have blazed the way to the point to which we will all eventually have to come in education. The sooner the better for Protestantism."

President James Arnold Blaisdell, Pomona College (Congregational), Claremont, Calif., writes: "I am glad to say that I find myself quite in agreement with your point of view. The distinct limitation of any educational institution to the administration or interests of a single denomination seems to me unfortunate. On the other hand, I am quite clear that no educational system is complete which does not make room for a frank and full consideration of the values of religion."

President A. D. Harmon, Cotner College (Disciple), Bethany, Nebr., writes: "I would dissent from some of the specific statements, but, in my judgment, the sum of your contention is correct. A united Christian college is the necessary sequence of a united Christian Church. A united Church is coming, and will continue to come, by means of propaganda and experimentation. In my judgment, a united Christian educational system must come in the same way. In the present status of our evolving social order the Christian college is indispensable. But for its protest, and its contribution, we would be left to a state system of education which is preeminently rationalistic and materialistic. The state system of education to-day has its outlook upon things, veiled under the word 'efficiency' which, in the long run, is crass materialism. The Church college, like the Church itself, carries the handicap of sectarianism, but it is potentially spiritual. In the present status of the social order there is a distinct place, in my judgment, for the Church college. In the ultimate system all education must be unified in its outlook upon life. Since we must work to this end through propaganda and experimentation I would hail with delight all working efforts in education that look to this end. I heartily endorse the bigger contentions urged in your article."

President W. W. Guth, Goucher College, Baltimore, Md., writes: "Strict denominational control is apt to hamper an educational institution. A college or university must be free from sectarianism in the strict sense in order to be truly an educational institution. There should be no sectarian test necessary for the board of trustees or for the members of the faculty or for the students."

President Henry C. King, Oberlin College (Congregational), Oberlin, Ohio, writes: "My feeling is that we must seek the largest measure of coöperation among the denominations in all our plans for higher education. I do not believe that the Christian colleges can make the growth or have the influence which they ought to have in any other way."

Professor Edward A. Wicher, San Francisco Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), San Anselmo, Calif., writes: "I have read your article with deep interest, and heartily agree with your conclusions. If there are to be denominational schools in the present condition of religious life in America they should be located on the campus of the state universities and federated around it. Your paper will be a wholesome influence."

President Frank J. Goodnow, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., writes: "The tendency of all higher educational institutions is away from

denominationalism. An interesting experiment is being made in the Australian universities. Different denominations are allowed to establish their own colleges as part of a university, the only requirement being that those taking university degrees must stand the university examinations. This system gives the denominations control over their colleges, but keeps them up to university standard."

President E. O. Sisson, University of Montana, Missoula, Mont., writes: "I am heartily in agreement with the main thesis of your article."

Chancellor S. B. McCormick, University of Pittsburgh (Presbyterian), Pittsburgh, Pa., writes: "Your article is an excellent statement, with much of which I am in cordial agreement."

President Robert J. Aley, University of Maine, Orono, Me., writes: "I have read your paper with great interest. You make a number of very telling and convincing points. I am in favor of interdenominationalizing the denominational schools of the country. I believe that this would have a strong influence to bring about Christian union."

Rev. Alfred H. Barr, pastor First Presbyterian Church, Baltimore, Md., writes: "I can see no reason why in some instances the feeble institutions should not come together on some coöperative basis, as has been done in the foreign fields. But in some other cases it would be best for both to die. I am not so much concerned with sectarian over-emphasis as in educational under-emphasis. Many ought to die because they are such poor schools. But I question whether the few remaining denominational colleges in the east would gain by being made undenominational."

Dean Granville D. Edwards, Bible College of Missouri (Disciple), Columbia, Mo., writes: "I went through your discussion of the denominational school in an attitude of Amen! *Amen!* AMEN! You made an exceptionally telling point in saying that just as we will not tolerate schools planned to emphasize cleavages politically, so will we not stand indefinitely for schools which emphasize cleavages in creed. We must bridge creedal gulfs just as we seek to bridge racial, national, and class gulfs if we would be assuredly safe and realize the finest results in our human relationships."

Mr. J. Henry Baker, Baltimore, Md. (Congregationalist), attorney, trustee of Dickinson College (Methodist), writes: "I am of the opinion that the denominational school emphasizes and tends to keep alive the *differences* of our various denominations, and this being true, it is detrimental to our religious life."

Dr. D. W. Ohern, Oklahoma City, Okla., oil producer, trustee of Phillips University (Disciple), East Enid, Okla., writes: "I have read your article very carefully. I desire to say that I think your position is quite correct. Being one of the board of trustees of one of the colleges of the Disciples, and therefore in a position to know something of the position in which our Church schools find themselves, I am constrained to say that your message is a timely one and that it is high time that all religious bodies take this matter under serious consideration."

Professor Frederick C. Eiselen, Garrett Biblical Institute (Methodist), Evanston, Ill., writes: "1. I fully agree with your fundamental proposition, that the great need of the present is to give to education the Christian vision, the Christian adjustment, the Christian fellowship and the Christian wholeness of life, rather than to stress the denominational ideals and the denominational viewpoint.

2. My experience with denominational institutions of learning leads me to think that the situation in the denominational schools is not quite as hopeless as your statements on pages ten and eleven would lead one to suspect.

3. My own opinion is that the next step is to universalize the spirit of Christian fellowship and Christian regard which now dominate certainly the better class of denominational institutions throughout the land. As to the

ultimate outcome I am not absolutely certin. If it were a matter of creed or form I think we might look forward to complete union, but since in some respects it is more a matter of temperament, it may well be that the temperamental differences may cause certain denominational divisions to continue. If these denominational divisions continue, it may well be that to some extent denominational educational institutions may also continue. This, however, need not prevent the carrying out of the spirit of the ideal on which all Christians will agree.''

Rev. Alfred W. Anthony, secretary Home Missions Council, New York, writes: ''The questions which seem to be raised by your paper are as follows:

1. The Christian Church must have schools, the atmosphere of which is Christian—at least in which Christian principles and Christian teachings are not lacking. Since as yet there are no central, united Christian agencies for maintaining such schools, the denominational school has a real place to fill and function to perform. But it should become, as it is becoming, interdenominationally-minded.

2. So long as Christians hold positive convictions respecting the teachings of Scriptures, and the body of Christian truth, they must maintain institutions for imparting to those who are to serve and represent them, these interpretations, and this body of truth. Naturally the broadest minded, and the most inclusive in their attitude toward, and their reception of, all truth, will give the best education and training; and will, in the long run, succeed and supplant others of the more sectarian type. An interdenominational seminary has a place of real usefulness. There are many such already in existence, only a few of which are such in name.''

Dr. C. M. Farmer, State Normal School, Troy, Ala., writes: ''I agree with your position as set forth in the paper. It could have been made much stronger and have involved many more things than are touched upon in it. In the first place let me say that the denominational spirit in Church schools is not apparently very strong. However, there is a strong undercurrent that makes it probably more effective because more insidious. Prospective students who have different religious convictions from that of the college are told that there are no denominational distinctions in the college while those of the same denomination as the college are urged to attend because of its denominational distinctions, that the denomination cannot exist and compete with others unless those who belong to the denomination patronize their own schools and a strong appeal to denominational pride is made. The strongest and most effective appeal for financial aid is to denominational prejudice and bigotry. But for this influence the denominational schools as such could not live a decade. I have known personally appeals to denominationalism to be effective in securing money and patronage when every other argument failed. In addition to the statements made in your paper, in which as stated above, I fully concur, I would mention these sins of the denominational schools:

'' 'First, display and false pretense, failure to exercise an open Christian attitude. A school man asked me a few days ago what I thought of denominational colleges after the experience I have had with them. I replied that in some ways the Christian colleges have the least true Christianity of any educational institutions I know.

'' 'Second, the financial suppression of faculty members. The money is expended on show and display to appeal for patronage to 'the best people' while the poor faculty can hardly buy bread.

'' 'Third, the suppression of ideas and opinions on scientific questions, and in lieu a prescribed orthodoxy. The denominational schools are not encouraging the discovery of the dissemination of truth in several ways.

'' 'Fourth, too much formal and theoretical religion and too little practical Christianity'.''

Dean Thomas M. Balliet, formerly of the School of Education, New York University, writes: "I agree with you in a general way. The day is past for founding new denominational schools and colleges. There are quite effective forces at work which I cannot take time to trace which will ultimately abolish such as now exist as denominational schools. I myself should prefer an undenominational theological school, and our best schools of this sort are rapidly discarding denominational limitations. Personally, I should not send a child of my own to any school of my own Church for the sake of the religious instruction; but the right must be conceded on moral and on legal grounds that people who want Church schools and are willing to pay for them, and not ask for public financial support of them out of the taxes, should have a right to have them."

Mr. W. P. Lipscomb, Washington, D. C., contractor and builder, trustee Lynchburg College (Disciple), Lynchburg, Va., writes: "I think you are on the right trail. Denominational schools, in my opinion, foster and breed narrow-mindedness, bigotry and strife among the Churches, all of which tend to the pulling away rather than cultivating the spirit of union among the Churches. I think if this course, dealing with such vital things, will be followed up, it will accomplish more for Christian unity than any other course that can be pursued."

Professor D. A. Hayes, Garrett Biblical Institute (Methodist), Evanston, Ill., writes: "I have read your article with interest and while I do not consider the existence of the denominational school as necessarily being as harmful as you might suggest, I find myself in fullest sympathy with your suggestion of coöperative tolerance and freedom in seeking and teaching the truth."

Professor R. M. Kurtz, Bible Teachers Training School, New York, writes: "Dr. Wilbert W. White has just called my attention to your article upon the denominational school. He was much pleased with it. I note that he has written to me, across the slip accompanying it, that 'we are with him.'"

Rev. Galen Lee Rose, minister First Christian Church (Disciple), Chico, Calif., writes: "Unquestionably you are right in your contention that the denominational school perpetuates divisions, narrows sympathies and fosters the denominational conscience."

Mr. W. W. Mills, Marietta, Ohio, banker, trustee Marietta College (Congregational), writes: "I thoroughly agree with your position. I do not believe in the strict denominational or sectarian school, but I do most earnestly believe in the idea of strict religious support and control."

Dean W. P. Lawrence, Elon College (Christian), Elon College, N. C., writes: "You are of opinion in your article that the denominational school as most of them are to-day in spirit and teaching, narrowed by sectarianism, has no just excuse for existence. I am of the same opinion."

Rev. R. B. Dodge (Congregationalist), San Francisco, Calif., writes: "You certainly have stated a truth remarkably clearly, and I wish to express my very hearty accord with the tenor of your statement."

Hon. W. B. Mathews, Charleston, W. Va., Clerk Supreme Court of Appeals of West Virginia, trustee West Virginia Wesleyan College (Methodist), Buckhannon, W. Va., writes: "As a member of the board of trustees of a Christian college I shall advocate the appointment of trustees to fill the vacancies as they may arise from time to time from other denominations than my own. I am firmly convinced, however, that the Christian college is still a necessity and will be until secular colleges teach more Christianity."

Dean Edward I. Bosworth, Oberlin College (Congregational), Oberlin, Ohio, writes: "It certainly seems to me true that any type of education that accentuates denominational differences is on the whole undesirable. It becomes more and more apparent that almost all of the points which serve

to divide Christians into 'denominations' are mainly in the sphere of ideas that are of second, third, or fourth rate importance and some of them of no importance whatever.''

Mr. A. C. Parker, Dallas, Texas, broker, trustee Midland College (Disciple), Midland, Tex., writes: ''I am impressed with your frankness and clearness in dealing with these great questions,—in fact, I might term it one of the great problems of the Church. Small Church schools and colleges are rapidly dying, in spite of the strenuous efforts being put forth by leaders in the various denominations to preserve them. Even the larger colleges and universities of the various denominations seem to be losing their prestige in spite of the heroic efforts of the Churches and religious leaders to prevent it. I have often made the statement that all of the denominational schools and colleges should be abolished and that only a few of the leading universities should be retained, and that these should be made so broad and liberal as to afford a congenial atmosphere for all classes of students, and that they should also have in their faculty representatives of various evangelical communions. You have handled this great question in an admirable manner. Your position can not be assailed by any except those of a sectarian inclination. If the unity of the Church is ever realized the schools of the Church must assume leadership, and these institutions must exemplify the fundamental principles that are so often contended for from the pulpits. Sectarianism will never go until we have done away with the hothouses which nourish it. I agree with you that the road to the solution of this great problem is perhaps long, and the realization of this desirable end would come only after the meeting and overcoming of almost every conceivable form of sectarian objection and opposition; but in my judgment it is bound to come, however long deferred by denominational spirit and the unwillingness to surrender any of the elements which have contributed to denominational prestige.''

Professor F. E. Lumley, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, writes: ''I read your article with absorbing interest and find myself in full accord with your position. Interestingly enough, I handed it to one of the other teachers and just this minute he had come in to say that he 'could not see but what you were right.' You have undoubtedly touched a very tender spot and some squirming will naturally follow. Many of the denominational colleges and seminaries are really no longer sectarian in any sense. Others, I am sure, have no other object than to bring support to denominationalism. These are the ones you have singled out most sharply.''

Second, those who oppose interdenominationalizing the denominational school:

The Baltimore Conference of the Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and other states characterized the paper as ''unchristian, unchurchly and impractical, an unworthy and useless scheme, preached by those who wander in the darkness as to what the Church really is, what true unity of faith and Christian principles mean and who have no true understanding or appreciation of the blessing of American liberty.''

Mr. T. W. Phillips, Jr., Butler, Pa., oil producer, trustee Bethany College (Disciple), Bethany, W. Va., writes: ''Many of your severe criticisms of the denominational schools are gratuitous. Denominational schools are frequently the result of a perfectly legitimate and highly commendable effort on the part of those who wish to perpetuate and promulgate principles which they deem are of vital importance. Many of your sweeping statements are rather ridiculous and some of the conditions you imply are grotesque.''

Rev. Z. T. Sweeney, trustee Butler College (Disciple), Indianapolis, Ind., writes: ''I oppose your thesis on the ground that it is entirely impractical.

It cannot be accomplished and it would not last twenty years if it were accomplished without a man's nature is eternally changed. All the reasons that you give on page 10 against denominational schools, I endorse. I endorse your statement on page 15 that 'the educational system of the Church should give Christian vision, Christian adjustment, Christian fellowship and Christian wholeness of life.' That is exactly the aim of Christian education, but it never can be brought about by interdenominationalizing the present denominations.''

Professor John M. Price, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Seminary Hill, Tex., writes: ''My opinion is rather unfavorable of your article. It impressed me as being rather biased or prejudiced against the denominational school. There did not seem to be a completely open mind on the subject. That may not be true to fact but the reading of the paper impressed me that way at any rate.''

Dean David H. Bauslin, Hamma Divinity School, Wittenberg College (Lutheran), Springfield, Ohio, writes: ''I can only regard your plan to interdenominationalize higher education as both impracticable and undesirable.''

President B. H. Kroeze, Jamestown College (Presbyterian), Jamestown, N. D., writes: ''There is nothing to your paper. You said it all in the story you relate which is more like fiction than truth. If the denominational college has ever had a place in education it has it now more than ever. Our land is full of the liberalism and radicalism which we have sown by the disregard for the very ideals which these institutions hold. What you say is largely imaginary. These institutions are not sectarian and do not seek to intensify the creed of any Church. I have been president of a denominational college in two different states for the past sixteen years and I have yet to find what you grow so eloquently on. We have Disciples, Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians and others on our faculty. We have all kinds of students, and they are not taught to hate each other because of their difference in belief, nor are they taught to disregard their religion. Each person is as free as the air to believe what he wishes. All that is done is the exaltation of the Bible on equal terms with science. Because your four young men elected to enter the ministry was no crime and they elected to enter the ministry of their own Church. Would not the Catholic have entered his priesthood had he taken his education in a Presbyterian college? I can show you where that has occurred. But as I say your paper is not worthy of discussion.''

President L. O. Lehman, Eureka College (Disciple), Eureka, Ill., writes: ''I cannot help but feel that you are quite largely setting up a straw man for your attack. I do not have a wide acquaintance with colleges, I will admit, but I know of no institutions that maintain the narrow denominational attitude which you assume is a part of the Church college. I feel sure that you have entirely misunderstood the present work of our Church colleges and since your assumption of their character is wrong, your conclusion of course has no foundation.''

President C. H. Little, Lutheran Theological Seminary and Waterloo College, Waterloo, Ontario, writes: ''Your article is interesting but not convincing. Your proposed substitute would only introduce confusion into the educational and religious world. Young men in such an institution would not know what to believe, or would follow the professor whose personality most appealed to them. Such an institution would be destructive of all distinctive doctrinal beliefs, and the result would be a spineless, wishy-washy form of Christianity that knows not what it believes, and wholly incapable of bearing witness to the truth. The denominational school is essential as long as denominations exist. If the latter are justifiable so also are their schools. Conscience cannot be forced; and as long

as there are differences in doctrine so long will there be and ought to be different Church organizations."

Librarian D. F. Estes, Colgate University (Baptist), Hamilton, N. Y., writes: "I should think that a denominational school of such a sort as you discuss in your paper would be a damage rather than an asset to education, religion and life as you imply, but certainly it is not necessary that a denominational school should be of that type and have such an influence as you object to. As a matter of fact, I never knew of such an institution. So far as my acquaintance goes, you are arguing against the non-existent. Another paper on the denominational school at its best instead of its worst is plainly needed as a foil lest the unthinking should be misled into supposing that all denominational schools are of the bad type which you hold up to reprobation."

President R. L. Thorp, Missouri Christian College (Disciple), Camden Point, Mo., writes: "The problem is not the denominational college, but denominationalism. It is true that it would be fine to have no sectarianism, but strong Christian colleges. But this cannot be with a divided Church any more than we can do away with the denominational Sunday-school and denominational worship. The college is doing much less to foster the denominational spirit than the Sunday-schools. Then why do you not advocate the abolishing of the Sunday-schools? It is because you have to do the best you can in spite of our division and pray for the unity of the Church. The same is true of the denominational college. The effect of your position will be to further hinder Christian education. The problem today in education is not that of battles between denominations, but it is whether or not Christianity is to have any place in education. I believe there is less denominational spirit in colleges than you think. I have reason to believe that in the majority of colleges, the controlling denominations do not have half the teaching force of their own membership. The problem of getting teachers has been such that all colleges have taken teachers of various beliefs. This naturally makes for a broad spirit of fellowship."

Dean Frank B. Taylor, Jamestown College (Presbyterian), Jamestown, N. D., writes: "You are seeing ghosts. There is in the Protestant colleges scarcely a trace of the exaggerated denominationalism that you have imagined. I have studied and taught in colleges of different denominational designation and but for the statements in the catalogs I could not for the life of me have told which was which. There is doubtless denominationalism of a mild type in the theological seminaries, but that is not a question of general education. It is rather a matter of denominationalism on its ecclesiastical side."

President Anthony C. Hageman, Hillsdale College (Classed as Baptist), Hillsdale, Mich., writes: "I have read your paper and believe that you have not a proper viewpoint or understanding of the value of Christian education. Our college is not a so-called denominational institution, yet I believe its work would be greatly advanced if it were. I am heartily in sympathy with the denominational college."

President Bernard I. Bell, Saint Stephen's College (Episcopalian), Annandale-on-Hudson, N. Y., writes: "I do not agree with you in the least. This may be because I am convinced that interdenominationalism is not the path toward Church unity. Renewed religion as a by-product of ecclesiastical compromise seems to be to be hopeless. It is putting the cart before the horse. We shall never have Church unity until it comes as a by-product of renewed devotion to our Lord in every communion."

Rev. T. W. Grafton, pastor Third Christian Church Indianapolis, Ind., trustee Butler College (Disciple), writes: "I have read with interest your paper on the denominational school, and frankly I hardly think you have done justice to the work done by our denominational colleges.

I feel that in our present condition the small college under the direction of some religious body has an important function. It seems to me what we need more than anything else is the Christian atmosphere of the college fostered under religious influence, and the small denominational school comes the nearest furnishing that.''

President W. H. Black, Missouri Valley College (Presbyterian), Marshall, Mo., writes: ''Your article is a good one, thought stimulating, well prepared, but when I came to the six points you name on pages 10 and 11 I was disappointed. Your statement, 'The presence of the denominational school in present day education therefore is a fundamental error,' I believe, itself, 'is a fundamental error,' first, because I think you have put an interpretation on the words 'denominational school' which they should not bear and which as a matter of fact they will not bear. If I were going to talk about these institutions I would use the language of the Presbyterian Church. It generally calls them 'Christian colleges,' and talks about Christian education, and I am sure there is no other thought in the mind of the Presbyterian Church than the most catholic sympathies and the most Christian purposes.''

Professor James M. Dixon, University of Southern California (Methodist), Los Angeles, Calif., writes, enclosing his comments in the University quarterly, *The Personalist*, as follows: ''The writer of the article does recognize the crying need of religion in our present day education; but he thinks that the denominational college, by 'teaching loyalty to the denomination and attempting to establish a denominational conscience' has become a hindrance rather than a help, and is 'therefore a fundamental error in present day education.' But surely it is more than evident that the Roman Catholic, whose type he sets out, will never coöperate with other 'sects.' Nor can the Episcopalian, with his devotion to 'orders,' very well combine with the Presbyterian or the Baptist. And the Baptist, so long as he insists on immersion and close communion, will also keep apart in a separate organization. All of them can work side by side in the mission field, for instance, harmoniously, and the tendency now—as shown in the Philippines—is to refrain from duplication in any territory. But the furnishing of funds, the supplying of suitable teachers, the necessary discipline, both for missions—which are largely educational—as well as for schools and colleges, come naturally from the Church organization. It is the principle of brotherhood in the denomination that has to be cultivated, and this is greatly improving, as Mr. Ainslie confesses. But there remains room for differences of creed, and the ignoring of these differences in the interests of a theoretical 'undivided Christianity' is a mistake of the same kind as the discounting of nations and nationality in the interests of a dreamy internationalism. In the political field the handling of issues by 'commissions' is notoriously unsatisfactory. So would be Mr. Ainslie's plan for the abolition of denominational schools, and their replacement by schools 'handled by a commission on Christian education.' ''

Third, those who favor interdenominationalizing the denominational school and are working at it:

Professor John W. Buckham, Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Calif., writes: ''I think you have done a real service in pointing out so clearly the restrictions of the denominational theological seminary. The rigid denominational school is certainly an anachronism at this period of Christian progress. We at this undenominational institution receive constant evidence of the great advantage of presenting Christianity from the undenominational viewpoint and of having students from many denominations working together in our classrooms and learning to understand each other and to share in the one common aim of helping to bring in the Kingdom of

God. Your suggestion as to the method of making the denominational school reflect the broader viewpoint of the Church as a whole seems to me especially wise and timely."

Professor George Dahl, Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn., writes: "Your article is most interesting. My experience here at Yale in our interdenominational divinity school has made me a firm adherent of the idea. A certain breadth of interest and sympathy are the natural products of such coöperation. Eventually interdenominational schools allied with the resources of great universities must win the field against all the bickerings of narrow denominationalism. The principle will prevail, for it is right."

Professor Edgar S. Brightman, Boston University, Boston, Mass., writes: "It seems to me that what you are contending for is undoubtedly the ideal in religious and theological education for which we ought to strive. But on the other hand, I feel that heaven cannot be gained at a single bound, and that the right thing to do is always that thing which will actually improve the existing situation. It appears to me that your presentation has left actual conditions too much in the background. I suppose that the most prosperous theological schools in the country are denominational; I am not clear after reading your paper what you would advocate as a practical policy. Should an immediate attempt be made to interdenominationalize all such schools (and colleges); or is it wiser, and in the end more ideal, to avoid destruction of valuable existing institutions (such as would doubtless ensue from such a program, if forced) to continue denominational institutions as centers of liberalizing influence working chiefly within the denominations they represent? It seems to me that this is the natural evolution. An attempt at immediate interdenominationalizing of present institutions would, if successful, leave the denominations still existing, but deprived of the liberal and progressive leadership that comes from these institutions. My own feeling is that we may best work toward the ideal at present by whole-hearted emphasis on the spirit of interdenominationalism, but that the time is not yet ripe to abandon denominational institutions wholesale. Boston University, for example, illustrates what I have in mind. Originally Methodist, all departments of the institution except the school of theology are now undenominational. In the college we have as many Jews and Catholics as Protestants, and the whole problem has been solved by natural evolution. Even the school of theology has a coöperative arrangement with the Harvard Divinity School. If an attempt had been made to break loose from Methodism at any point in the history, the result would doubtless have been far less satisfactory than it now is. I believe in evolution, not revolution in most matters."

Rev. Rockwell Harmon Potter, pastor First Church of Christ (Congregational), Hartford, Conn., writes: "Your paper points in the right direction—in which Union Seminary and Yale and Hartford have made good progress."

Professor Calvin M. Clark, Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me., writes: "Our Seminary had already in the past come to occupy the position of a broadly Christian school such as you ideally portray in your paper, at least in largest measure. In proof of our practically interdenominational position let me state that, within my own time of service here, we have educated Baptists, Free-Baptists, Methodists—both Episcopal and Wesleyan—Presbyterians, Unitarians, Friends, Protestant Episcopalians, Christians, Disciples, and possibly others. Our trustees are tied to no creed, and never have been. There is no seminary creed and practically never has been. Every member of the faculty presents on entry into office his own individual statement of faith, as a Congregational minister does on going to his Church, and, as the latter, so the former is accepted and approved in his chair on the basis of that personal statement. As I read

your summaries on pages 10 and 11 of your article, I find my mind chiming with the latter part of each item beginning with a 'whereas' (rather than with the first part), a mind simply that of the state of things among us, not simply as my own private view."

Dean William F. Badé, Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Calif., writes: "I have read your article with great interest, and with entire approbation. You have hit the nail upon the head when you point out that the building and upkeep of our denominational fences are provided for in denominational seminaries. There is no good reason why they should be perpetuated any longer as distinctly denominational institutions. They should be merged in larger institutions in order that the financial endowments may render a service proportionate to their size. To my mind it is almost as foolish to set up denominational philosophies and theologies as to teach denominational chemistry and mathematics. Already the larger seminaries which are training men for a variety of denominations are spreading the leaven of Christian unity and the more we can turn the light of criticism upon the divisive character of denominational seminaries the better. I wish you all success in your onslaught on this old bulwark of ecclesiastical mediaevalism."

Professor B. W. Bacon, Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn., writes: "The last vestige of denominationalism disappeared from Yale Divinity School some ten years ago, certainly for the advantage of all. The denominational school may well have *a* place, but not the place of rivalry to undenominational institutions."

Professor George F. Moore, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., writes: "Inasmuch as I am a member of a university faculty of theology which has been for half a century undenominational in principle, in which at present there are representatives of both branches of the Congregational Church, Episcopal, Baptist, and Roman Catholic, and we are in close affiliation with the faculties of Andover Seminary, the Episcopal School in Cambridge, the Newton Theological Institution, and the Theological School of Boston University (Methodist), it would not be becoming for me to express myself in a sense adverse to the denominational school. I can only say that we are entirely satisfied both that our principle is the only sound one for a university faculty, and that our relation to denominational faculties with which we are associated is most cordial and most profitable on all sides."

Dr. W. S. Lindsay, Topeka, Kans., physician, trustee of Washburn College, writes: "I heartily agree with your theme in general. I think as you suggest that the interdenominational school is the best expression of Christian education. On our board of trustees of Washburn College we have the Congregational, Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian and Episcopal Churches represented."

Principal L. E. Camfield, Ward Academy, Academy, S. D., writes: "I know enough of denominational school life to wish that a part at least of your program might be adopted. I refer to your advocacy of an interdenominationalizing policy. In fact I think that is what we have here at Academy though in a very, very limited field."

Fourth, those who recognize the seriousness involved in our present day educational system but do not see its solution in the interdenominationalizing processes in all instances as suggested in the paper:

Rt. Rev. Thomas F. Gailor, president of Council Protestant Episcopal Church, New York, writes: "I have read your paper with deep interest.

I. In the first place, I think that in all this discussion of Christian

unity, we must agree upon a limit to our surrenders. Christianity must stand for something to differentiate it from other forms of religion. It is now understood that both Mohammedans and Buddhists are to have their temples in this country with colleges and schools to propagate their faith. Therefore all the institutions that call themselves Christian will be compelled to define their position. My point is, that there is a real residuum of Christian dogma, that is of defined and acknowledged belief, by which we must test the claim to be called Christian. Does Unitarianism or Christian Science stand this test?

II. Admitting that the word Christian connotes a definite conception of God and man, it would seem to be suicidal for Christians to permit their children to grow up without definite Christian instruction, and that means Christian schools.

III. In the present condition of the Christian world, the Christian faith is held and taught in varying fashions by different groups of Christians. All the groups, with very few exceptions, hold the fundamental principles of the faith; but human weakness, selfishness, and temperament have crystallized these groups and put them in competition with one another, to the grievous hindrance of the extension of the Kingdom of Christ. At the same time, the fact must be recognized that the preservation of the Christian faith depends, under God, upon the loyalty of the members of each group of the faith as that group represents it. Undenominational Christianity is no Christianity at all. It is a vain attempt to get the least common divisor of all the tenets of all the bodies that call themselves Christians. Whereas the only hope I can see of a really United and Catholic Church is an organization, which will include in its large freedom all the essential characteristics of all the groups, giving scope for the expression of all the temperamental preferences of individual souls. I am sorry that you referred with approval to the 'union' of the Cumberland Presbyterian and the Northern Presbyterian Churches. It did a grave injustice to many thousands of good people, deprived them of their property, and set back the cause of real unity a hundred years.

IV. Just as loyalty to the denomination at the present time preserves the faith, so the denominational school or college is our surest dependence for really Christian training of our children. I take issue with Dr. Hugh Black's statement, that 'students in state universities take more interest in religious matters that do the students in denominational colleges.' I have spent thirty years in educational work, have visited many state universities and many denominational colleges, and Dr. Black's statement contradicts my whole experience. I take exception to your suggestion, that the denominational school or college is so much absorbed by its denominational programme as to be incapable of viewing life as a whole, and of giving a liberal education. The denominational institutions I have been connected with are not open to this criticism. On the contrary the fundamental principles of the Christian religion have been so emphasized as to make one forget the particular denominational coloring. I am sure that this is true of my own college, the University of the South. In conclusion I beg to say that the preservation of a definite Christianity in this country, with definite Christian moral standards, so largely depends upon the maintenance of avowedly Christian educational institutions that I am willing to risk all the danger of narrowness in order to protect the truth."

Professor J. K. Shellenberger, Cotner College (Disciple), Bethany, Nebr., writes: "Ideally, the denominational schools should *all* close. They should not open for another semester. The history of the influence shows that they have been divisive. And while much of the sectarian bitterness in them has died, yet their very existence emphasizes the thing that Christendom cannot afford to have emphasized much longer. But what will we *do?* For, after all, our philosophy can become valuable only in action.

And whether we will or no, we *must* act in this present. Shall we discontinue a method that, despite its weaknesses, has Christ as its dynamic, before we have headed the way of real freedom in the larger fraternity? My own thought is that Christian schools ought to unite. You are right in saying it would be a good thing, for instance, for Disciples to study Methodism under the tutorship of a Methodist. But likewise should Methodists study the Dispicles of Christ under the tutorship of a 'Disciple?' And so on including all the denominations possible. And this should be done under the same roof. I can think of nothing that would so effectively conserve every good thing in each denomination, and at the same time weed out all prejudice. But just now such a thing is a dream. Some day it, or some other equally effective scheme, will be realized. And I am praying for it, working for it, talking for it. But in the meantime! What? My chief criticism of your paper is that it manifests impatience. We are headed right. The spirit of unity is at work. God does not work by revolution but by regeneration. And that, from our viewpoint, is a slow process. But nevertheless it spells progress. I would not contend that we should be satisfied with our present educational situation. Its inadequacy is so appalling that it is tragic.''

President James G. K. McClure, McCormick Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Chicago, Ill., writes: ''My opinion is—(1) that the denominational school is the creature of the denomination, and is designed to express the mind of the denomination. It is not the creator of the denomination, and ordinarily cannot create the thought of the denomination. (2) The denominational school will remain as long as the denominations are virile and believe that they stand for some worthy distinctive principles. (3) The more the spirit of brotherliness in Christ exists between denominations, the more fraternal and coöperative will be the teachings of the denominational schools. (4) There are today denominational schools of other communions which heartily accept the Roman Catholic, the Episcopalian, the Baptist and the Disciple as full brethren in Chirst, and as *valid* ministers of the grace of God. (5) Sometimes proximity of denominational teaching tends to sharpen difference into antagonism. (6) When denominations as denominations will accept one another's creeds and particularly one another's 'orders,' the denominational school may and should cease. Until then, our main work must be along the lines of bringing the Roman Catholic, the Episcopalian, the Baptist, the Disciple, and all other denominations to see heart to heart, and believe that each and all are *valid* instruments of the *full* grace of God.''

Rev. Raymond Calkins, pastor First Congregational Church, Cambridge, Mass., writes: ''I have carefully read your article. With much of it I am in entire agreement. That such education tends to be sectarian and divisive and thus to perpetuate divisional Christianity, I am inclined to agree. I do find myself asking, however, in case there are true religious values in the separate approaches to the common Christian idea, how can these values be conserved if a type of education is evolved which supersedes, if it does not eliminate, them. In a word, if these values need to be perpetuated must they not be embodied in some form of educational institution? If to the Churches could be frankly entrusted the development of denominational idea, and if the seminaries could be entirely interdenominational in their educational outlook, both ends might be reached. I fear, however, that such an ideal is fairly remote, for is not the resurgence of denominationalism one of the strongest aspects of the war's aftermath?''

Professor Francis J. Hall, General Theological Seminary, (Episcopal), New York, writes: ''That the denominational school has serious limitations and disadvantages you have clearly shown. It cannot be reasonably denied. The leading thought that is suggested to me by your presenta-

tion is that the denominational school is an inevitable by-product and revelation of conscientious adherence to denominational conceptions of Christianity, one which will stand or fall with the vitality or decadence of such conceptions. The inference which I am constrained to make is, that the real solution of the difficulties which you so clearly indicate lies in a solution of the larger problem of which it is an incident—the problem of the present divergence of Christian faith and order embodied in denominationalism itself. Admitting that this divergence, as between many Protestant denominations, is not now at least such as should keep them apart, the remedy lies in their reunion and coördination in the education of their young. But the divergences between sacerdotal and anti-sacerdotal Christians are deemed by their respective maintainers to be vital. They affect in radical ways the religious positions, ideals and practices which they believe they ought to inculcate in their children. Education is not Christian when its religious and secular branches are mutually sundered for religion, if true at all, is the organizing principle of life as a whole, furnishing its standpoint and determining its dominant aim. But this is equivalent to saying that religion must be inculcated in its wholeness, and with determinate teaching of its truths. To a sacerdotalist, for instance, religion is mutilated unless the sacramental elements thereof are given full and clear emphasis, along with the background of evangelical doctrine which these presuppose. This is not and cannot be done in an undenominational school, which necessarily teaches only the residuum of religion that remains when the differences between Christian bodies have been eliminated—practically only an ethical idealism. In our universities to-day the influences for scepticism are very strong—not less so because there is not usually any formal propaganda in that direction. I know this from sad experience. As theological teacher I find I have often to eradicate, if I can, a form of thought that precludes any recognition that Christian doctrine in its more fundamental lines can be a subject-matter at all of valid certainty. Our secular schools are producing a generation of pagans—pagans in fundamental thinking, even when Christians in nominal allegiance. The sum of the matter is that Christian believers who see these evils will be driven by conscience to provide for a *determinately* religious education, and this means one which does justice to their conception of Christian faith and practice. I do not see how their attitude is open to criticism, except by giving true religion a secondary and non-determinate place. I cannot do this. Denominational schools represent denominational consciences. The remedy lies in the cure of denominationalism—the growth of one mind in one great Church of Christ. To coöperate in religious education presupposes a common mind as to what is involved in true religion.''

Professor Garrett Droppers, Williams College (Congregational), Williamstown, Mass., writes: ''I believe that you are discussing a question worthy of the attention of all Churchgoers. This question indeed goes back to the days of the Reformation and raises the issue whether the Protestant Reformation ever really accomplished the reform it intended. I am a Protestant of Protestants with the 'dissidence of dissent,' as Burke says, in my veins. Yet I can see that with Protestantism as it is, America is bound to become Catholic. The Roman Catholic Church wins in the long run in the United States and this is because the Protestants are divided into many sects and quarrelling amongst themselves. Personally I believe we should unite with the least amount of compromise possible. Although I am a Unitarian I should like to see a Protestant union of Churches into the Episcopal Church. This Church has a very wide amount of liberty, has but a minimum amount of sacerdotalism and yet enough to satisfy those who like ritualism. In fact I do not see why any Christian cannot adequately express his Christian life and convictions in the Episcopal Church. And this being so it is merely a form of selfishness to fight for

the shibboleths of the small Protestant sects. However, I have not much hope for such a desirable union and so I predict that the Roman Catholic Church will win in the United States. The Protestants will dwindle and deservedly so, because they were not willing to forgo the lesser to achieve the greater result."

President W. A. Harper, Elon College (Christian), Elon College, N. C., writes: "You are right in your position that the denominational college is a stronghold of denominational life. The very reason, however, that impels you to oppose the denominational college is in the mind of its supporters the chief necessity for it. I have had some experience in soliciting funds for such a school and I know that the great majority of givers to education are influenced by their desire to see their own conception of Christian truth propagated. What you regard as a weakness, the plain men and women of the Churches regard as the highest virtue. The issue is clearly drawn. They want the thing you oppose, and for the very reason you oppose it. What you really object to is denominationalism, or to be perfectly frank, sectarianism. You have discovered too that the great majority of the denominational colleges are not sectarian in their teaching any more. What you really plead for is the 'interdenominationalizing' of Christian education. Can this really come while we have denominations, except in rare instances? Ought we not rather to strike hard at the very heart of the trouble? The denominational college is merely a symptom of denominationalism, as is the Church paper. The quack physician treats symptoms. The real physician diagnoses the case and applies his remedy to the underlying cause. Our disease is denominationalism. The Master Himself has prescribed the cure. We read it in John 17:21. We cannot cure the ills of the denominational colleges while the festering sore, the cancerous growth of denominationalism afflicts the body of Christ. And when denominationalism has been cured in the reunion of Christ's disciples, even as He prayed, then the denominational college will have become the Christian college, for which there will ever be need under a civil government requiring the absolute separation of Church and State."

Rev. M. J. Bradshaw, secretary Congregational Education Society, Boston, Mass,, writes: "It seems to me that as a matter of fact there is great need for educational experimentation. I think that a way of progress is along this line. There are differences within Protestantism, very vital differences. Why not do our best to find out precisely, if possible, the social value of these different viewpoints? What we need is not the attempt to remove all differences, an attempt which inevitably opens us to the danger of becoming colorless, but we should rather attempt in a scientific way to work out the implications of different viewpoints. I believe that the primary difficulty is with the denominational leaders rather than with the college people. As I see it, the great cleavage in our day is between those who taken the historical viewpoint in religion and those who bow before a fixed authority."

Dean Henry B. Washburn, Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass., writes: "I want to thank you most heartily for your article. I am inclined to think you are laboring under the impression that denominational schools cannot exist without a certain amount of hard feeling. Furthermore you seem to imagine that denominational schools are intent upon sectarian emphasis rather than upon real religion or real scholarship. Assuming that these facts are true, your conclusions are correct. Is there not, however, another side? We here at Cambridge have three theological schools and one university closely affiliated. We like the affiliation because it throws our students together as well as the members of the faculties, thereby keeping our minds open and our sympathies sensitive. We like the denominational aspect of our schools because each school can make its own contribution to the common life of the neighborhood, and each school

may have its own spiritual life. These two results should be looked upon in the light of real scholarly expression and real religious expression, and each school's contribution should be valued by the other schools. From this point of view it would seem to me that denominational schools are an asset rather than a liability. Once assume a friendly and sympathetic relationship, and the problem is solved. Once assume that we can have nothing but denominational schools, and we lose an immense amount of the finer shades of opinion in both scholarship and religion, and as for worship we find ourselves reduced to a drab medium of expression which appeals to practically nobody.''

A number of other opinions are summed up in the following letter:

Professor M. L. Bonham, Jr., Hamilton College (Presbyterian), Clinton, N. Y.: ''I have long believed that the denominational school, both as a preparatory institution and as a college has outlived its usefulness. I had felt that the only denominational institution of an educational nature, which still had a right to exist was the theological seminary. Since reading your article I am prepared to follow you in thinking it should go into the discard too, and let the ministry be educated at non-denominational schools. However, I fear that the denominations, and particularly the seminaries, will not agree with you. Perhaps the most that can be hoped for, for some years to come, is that seminaries may be persuaded to require as conditions for admission graduation from a non-denominational college or university, with at least one year of graduate study at a university. Even that step forward will be hard to secure, as long as the seminaries find their present difficulty in securing candidates for the ministry.

''With one factor in your interesting and scholarly paper I find myself at issue. Like many other leading thinkers of today, you are evidently strongly in favor of Church union, with the corollary disappearance of the denominations. I cannot follow you there. It seems to me, since the tendency to vary is one of the laws of progress, that it is a good thing that there are enough Churches for any one who really desires spiritual fellowship to find one in which he can feel at home. I am quite certain that my own Church is the best one *for me*, but equally certain that it would be the worst for some people, and of little benefit to others. So I should be sorry to see Church union at the present, believing that it would soon lead to new schisms.

''I readily grant that we have more denominations than are necessary and see no valid reason why such institutions as the Presbyterian, Congregationalist and Dutch Reformed Churches should not unite. It would be quite feasible, I think, to reduce the number of our denominations, and still steer clear of rigid uniformity, which would mean stagnation. Interdenominational coöperation, rather than unification, seems the best plan. For this end your suggestion of training all ministers in an undenominational seminary, where they will have the benefits of contact and coöperation with all lines of religious thought, is the best means. I trust that you will find it practicable to put your essay into the hands of governing bodies of all our Churches and seminaries, as well as into the hands of all teachers in seminaries and denominational schools, and the editors of all Church papers.''

There needs to be added only a paragraph in closing this collection of opinions. The paper in question raises

but one issue and that is the necessity of interdenominationalizing all denominational schools in America—from the parochial school to the denominational university and theological seminary, as is being so satisfactorily done in many instances on the foreign missionary field and in a few instances in America. There is no suggestion of any revolutionary plans, but instead the establishing of evolutionary processes under the guidance of a Christian commission. The issue is not raised regarding the small school nor the state university. It attempts to deal solely with the denominational school, to make it Christian, representing the Christian thought and experience of the whole community, rather than denominational, which necessarily represents only a part of the Christian thought and experience of the community. What is being so generally done in coöperative educational work in China, etc., we ought to be able to do in America, unless the atmosphere of heathenism furnishes the opportunity to freer coöperation than the denominational atmosphere of America. The interdenominationalizing policy is the scientific method of approach, for there are values in all these denominations. These values depreciate when separated; they increase when coördinated. The opinions herein cited, irrespective to which classification they belong, reveal a necessity more impelling than the paper dared to affirm. American Christianity faces a crisis in her educational system which can be met only by adopting such unitary processes as will coördinate her entire educational efforts, from which the good of none will be excluded.

THE DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOL—A REJOINDER

Dr. Ainslie's article on "Has the Denominational School a Place in Present Day Education?" which has been so widely circulated, certainly deserves thoughtful consideration and open-minded judgment as to the issues involved therein. Inasmuch as Dr. Ainslie has invited suggestions and criticisms with respect to it, I am venturing to comply with his request. Before going into a critique of the essential arguments advanced I desire to add a word of appreciation of Dr. Ainslie's courage to speak out boldly on this important topic; of his magnanamous spirit as evidenced in every paragraph; and of his excellent literary style which the article evidences. It is an able production—ably conceived and ably written.

However much I admire this excellent paper and its gracious author I find myself compelled to dissent-not from its general position regarding the unity of the Church, but from its assumptions. There are certain premises which Dr. Ainslie takes as his starting points and which he accepts without questioning, which are, in my judgment, fallacious. He is wrong in his major assumptions. Therein lies not only the weakness of the paper but its grave danger as well. If these assumptions are to go unchallenged and the contentions which Dr. Ainslie makes are to be taken at their face value, then I fear that this article will do great damage—not only to Christian education, but to the very cause for which Dr. Ainslie so constantly and passionately pleads. May I be pardoned the impertinence of pointing out the fallacies which underlie the contention for the abolition of the denominational school.

One of the factors always necessary to any clean-cut discussion of an issue is a clear definition of the terms involved. In this vital matter Dr. Ainslie is especially

in error. I have no desire to cavil or quibble, over non-essentials, or to becloud the issue by discussing incidentals, but it does seem important to know just what it is that Dr. Ainslie is talking about. He uses the vague, indeterminate word "school." Just what does he mean by that term? Does he mean academies, training schools, etc? Does he mean the standard—four year course—Christian college? Or does he mean theological seminaries? It makes a very great difference what he means. If he means theological seminaries, then I find myself in substantial agreement with most that he has to say. If, however, he means the Christian college—so-called denominational—then I cannot agree. Does he mean all schools of whatever sort supported by the various Churches? I assume that he means this latter thing and therein lies his first fallacy; namely, the use of a general term to cover a specific contention. He has swept too much into his thesis by his terminology. For to contend for the abolition of all schools of whatever sort supported by the church would be disastrous, both educationally and religiously as I shall further point out. Dr. Ainslie has tried to prove too much.

This brings us to a second and even more serious defect in the use of terms. What does Dr. Ainslie mean by "denominational" school? Does he mean any school which maintains an affiliation with any particular religious body? If he does, then I am confident there are scores of colleges—under Church auspices—which will repudiate the imputation. The assumption that Church colleges so-called denominational—are for the most part, sectarian in their spirit and denominational in their outlook, is false. Precisely the reverse is the case. Dr. Ainslie admits that some are not. I maintain that most are not. I am not now referring to theological seminaries, for a very much greater number of them are committed to the denominational bias. What I mean to say is that the vast majority of Church colleges are not

sectarian. That there are some sectarian colleges I admit, but they are the exception and not the rule. Dr. Ainslie's assumption is the opposite. The truth is that Church colleges are not sectarian, because they cannot be and actually be educational institutions worthy of the name.

Intercollegiate contacts are too numerous and potent to permit the sectarian spirit to dominate. The student bodies are more or less interdenominational in their character. Then there is the constant impingement of the spirit of one college upon another, due to the multiplicity of intercollegiate activities. Intercollegiate oratorical contests, debates, athletics, fraternities, Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. conferences, student volunteer conventions—state and national; all these and many other student relationships, make impossible the spirit of exclusiveness and sectarian ambitions. And what shall we say of the interchange of faculties? The faculty of the average college is gathered from the four quarters of the educational world. I have in mind now one typical Church college which has a distinctly Christian atmosphere and spirit, that has twenty-three different colleges and universities represented on its faculty. Those men and women are cosmopolites. They cannot be encased by any sectarian walls. Besides there are all the many state and national faculty associations. There is the Association of American University Professors; the Modern Language Association; the botanical societies; the history, mathematics, sociology, philosophy, chemistry, physics, religious education, New Testament, Old Testament—and every other kind of—association; all of which hold national gatherings and nearly all of which publish some sort of magazine for the interchange of ideas. These are the antipodes of denominationalism. But above all there is the spirit of modern learning itself. The modern method of approach, whether it be in the sciences, the humanities, or what not, is the spirit

of open-mindedness. Furthermore it is progressive in its outlook and is never satisfied to take opinions ready made. The creeds have a hard time in the presence of the scientific, historical method of approach which characterizes present-day education. Modern education knows no such thing as denominational lines. It is a well-known fact that the colleges are always the center of attack from the denominationally minded. The most powerful ally Dr. Ainslie has in the world to-day for the breaking down of denominational lines and the destruction of the sectarian spirit, and for the bringing in of that glad day when all the people of God will be one, is to be found in the Christian colleges of our land. When you seek to destroy them, you are putting to the sword your best friends. They spell the death of denominationalism.

A third fallacy is to be found in Dr. Ainslie's assumption that, so far as education is concerned, the sectarian spirit is confined to Church schools. By no means. Granted for the sake of argument that educational, denominational propaganda is confined to Church schools, there is to be found elsewhere in education a sectarianism of another sort, which with the destruction of the Church college, would not be as Utopian as Dr. Ainslie imagines. The political doctrine of the separation of Church and State has often been pressed to absurd lengths in our tax-supported system of education. There is the sectarianism of "non" and "anti" Church as well as the sectarianism of "pro" denomination. There is the sectarianism of indifference, of condescension, of aloofness, of supererogation, and even intolerance; which has all too commonly characterized education divorced from Church support and influence. Read the tragic story of the moral and religious decay of those modern nations which have relied completely upon a national system of education, without Church colleges. It is by no means reassuring.

Then there is the sectarianism of what, for want of a better phrase, I am pleased to call, practical materialism—the sectarianism of the emphasis upon things; the sectarianism of a bread and butter education; the sectarianism of false ideals of success; the sectarianism of Moloch and Mammon. Much as I hate the present denominational order, I fear this latter sectarianism far more than the former. And the antidote for it is the Christian college. We need now and shall need ever and anon, colleges which would rather make a man than a mechanic, and which consider it their chief business to teach young men and women the worth of ideas and the glory of ideals and which have set themselves to the task of turning out leaders who shall help to bring speedily to pass that new heaven and new earth which shall constitute the Kingdom of God on the morrow. Nothing in my judgment would be more disastrous both educationally and religiously than to carry the arguments of Dr. Ainslie's paper to their logical conclusions and to see to it that those conclusions were carried into effect. It would mean the doing away with the schools where one can get best the full orbed life of which Dr. Ainslie speaks.

This leads to the fourth and last fallacy which I shall mention; namely, the assumption that you fulfil by destroying. We have in the problem with which Dr. Ainslie wrestles the ever puzzling question of how to bring the ideal out of the real, or better still, the real up to the ideal. It is the deep-seated paradox, which runs throughout all life. But the problem certainly cannot be solved by annihilating that which is, or by detaching ourselves from the existent order. We have to live in the world in which we now are. It is our duty to help make a better world, of course. But the question is not only What? but How? Granted that we need Christian union, the question remains, How? I hope Dr. Ainslie will pardon the seeming discourtesy when I say that it appears to me

that it is in his attempt to, or rather failure to, answer the "How?" with definiteness and tangibility which constitutes not only the weakness of the paper under discussion, but the whole proposition of Christian unity. Perhaps it is asking too much of any one to answer that question; but if one attempts it, then he should be willing to be held accountable to practical tests. And certainly it would be a most impracticable procedure to abandon at this time the Church colleges with nothing better in sight. To do so would mean for the Churches individually and collectively to commit suicide.

A leaderless Church could not function. To destroy the present base of supplies, would be not only poor generalship, but foolhardy. You cannot get somewhere else unless you start from where you are. There is no such thing as a man's lifting himself by his own bootstraps. You cannot reach the ideal by one huge leap, or by the destruction of those forces which are now working toward that end. At the present the Church does not have the facilities nor the machinery by which to train a leadership aside from the schools and colleges which it supports. To kill them now means to kill itself. A series of dead communions might bring Christian union, but it would be the silent and inert union of the tomb. It would have the chill of sepulchral dampness upon it and the terms of its consummation would be chiseled on tablets of stone. No, Christian union will not come by the destruction of, or even the abandonment of, the Church colleges. Quite the opposite.

I cannot close this paper without a word concerning the illustration of the four boy friends, from a Texas town, with which Dr. Ainslie began his article and which in a way constituted the major premise of all he had to say. He bemoans the fact that they came back from their respective colleges ardent denominationalists. We all do. But does Dr. Ainslie think for a single moment that, had they gone to some undenominational school and

remained in the ministry they would have been any less denominational? Does Dr. Ainslie think that these men came back from college more denominational than when they started? I will hazard the guess that if they attended the average Church college of their own communion they were less denominational as seniors than they were as freshmen.

Furthermore, what would Dr. Ainslie have these men do? Suppose they were to go to some union school and all come out entirely undenominationalized; and suppose they all wanted to give their lives to the ministry; where could they preach? Which Church would Dr. Ainslie have them all go into? In other words, do not these men have to work in the midst of the existent order? And are they not made denominational by the Church and not the college? Would the abolishment of the Church college solve the problem? To claim that it would means to confuse effect with cause; to substitute nothing for something; to create an educational vacuum in the life of the Church. One might go on piling up valid and irrefutable arguments in behalf of the Christian college —or Church college, if you please—justifying it from the standpoint of sound economics, effecient education, and wise statesmanship, but that is a subject for another paper. It is sufficient here to point out the fallacies of Dr. Ainslie's assumptions which I have tried to do with clearness and becoming courtesy.

H. O. Pritchard.

Disciples' Board of Education,
Indianapolis, Ind.

CHRISTIAN UNITY—WHAT TO DO NEXT

The many-sided issue of Christian unity has frequently evoked the question—what can be done under all circumstances to achieve the desired coöperation among the numerous denominations? Alliances have been suggested; concordats have been drawn up; and resolutions have been adopted. If all that has been said and done in connection with the various irenic efforts could once be collected together, they would fill many good sized volumes.

Christian unity is not a new issue. Its consideration is by no means in the first stages of development. The memory of the Christian life in the early eras still sounds its tuneful harmony. Ever since the great schism between the East and the West in the eleventh century, and the great upheaval at the time of the Reformation, the longing heart of man has held as its inmost desire that Christians should be one. The demand for unity has recently become insistent in every practical, economic, ethical, or religious sense. "Unity is in the very air that we breathe" has been well said. The world war has taught a lesson well worth applying—that the allied powers achieved a victory that must have been impossible if each had continued independent action. So much has already been done in the twentieth century in dealing with the diverse interests in the many other departments of life, that it is only to be expected that it should contribute something towards solving the difficulties of disunited Christendom. Nor is it too much to say that of all questions before the minds of men to-day, the way to achieve unity is nearly, if not altogether, the most important. In fact the distinctive problem of the present is the problem of uniting the Christian Church.

What to do next in behalf of Christian unity is the subject of our thoughts. The first requirement is to achieve a decided agreement, based on past experiences,

as to what we should *not* do as well as to what we might attempt. The present outlook suggests a fourfold development of thought to be considered:

1st—Christian unity is a *problem,* and will be solved by dealing with it as a problem.

A problem is a question demanding some answer as to how things that are going wrong may be made to go right, so that the proper and desirable results may follow. Let us all be convinced that neither theories nor schemes nor resolutions will ever solve this problem.

2nd—Christian unity is a *spiritual problem.* It must be dealt with in the way of the Spirit.

Most people seem to overlook the fact that the great gift of the Holy Spirit was given amid social relationships. We all remember that a number of the disciples of Christ were all with one accord in one place, when there came that sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind. Now, spirituality is not sentimentality; it is not having a good intention and leaving the rest for the Lord to carry out in His own appointed time. It is not the Lord's business to solve the problem of unity, while we wait inactive. It is necessary that we coöperate with Him, using the means which He has placed at our disposal.

Spirituality means real hard work on the Christian's part. It means man's actions undertaken with his eyes open and his heart exercised.

3rd—Christian unity is distinctly a *Christian problem.*

Life and love are two great features that must set forth the even balance of the faith. It is by the use of such that the distinctive features and characteristics of Christianity are to be maintained, and also that the very fundamentals of Christianity, in its establishment, are to be duly considered.

4th—Christian unity is definitely a *human problem.*

It is the man knowing, feeling and willing—the whole

of man and not any one part that is so necessary in this work. One of the most encouraging signs toward the unity problem is the increased use and importance of psychology in our religious thinking. It has been well said, "Logic, if it leads to good conclusion, bids us mind the facts before we employ the reason." The religious life is like an orchestra that calls for harmony for its best results. But to-day it is the bass horn that spoils the harmony on account of its over-emphasis and self-importance.

The unity problem has a distinct goal towards which all efforts tend, and that is to make the 178 varieties or classifications of Christians appear and act as one large family. Such an aim may seem to some a mere dream, impossible of accomplishment; also perhaps, to many too fanciful to be seriously considered. We should recall the statement once made: "The only difference between the difficult and the seemingly impossible is that the impossible takes a little longer time."

But in order to make these 178 varieties really one, a sharp distinction should ever be maintained between unity and uniformity, which are not the same in essence or in value. And besides that a clear and definite statement should be made as to the meaning of unity itself.

What is to be done next to advance the great object of Christian unity? There is great need of education, so that Christians may better understand the mind of Christ on this great subject. Many obstacles to-day stand in the way of a more perfect understanding of the Master's mind. Many troublesome non-essentials have been collected during the ages of the past. These must all be removed before any real progress can be made. Furthermore, it should be considered that the divisions of Christendom, as they have been handed down from the past, have mostly been caused by making self and not God the great object of interest. How easy it is to

exalt personal ideas as all important, and maintain them against the ideas of others. But the statement applies here: "The centrifugal age is at an end, and the centripetal age has begun." Yet, notwithstanding the fact that this is a "New Era," we should realize that our present conditions are the effect of self-opinionation, self-will, and self-seeking.

The resultant religious atmosphere that we breathe to-day is unchristian, for individual ideas have proved to be the curse of Christianity, just as individual whims and fancies are to-day most frequently accepted as Christ's truth. Both the ideas and fancies have become idols before which people make obeisance.

But what is the trouble with the average Christian that he is willing and able to remain so far removed from the essence of Christ's truth, and also finds it difficult to realize the power of that truth? Well, for brevity's sake, I shall be dogmatic in replying to this question. *Disunity, which is to say, the present condition of Christianity, is a disease, and religiously we are all living,* as far as our mental and moral viewpoints are concerned, *amid diseased conditions.* Surely everyone to-day who cares for Christ and His truth and has any depth of feeling is simply tired of the confusion, the wrangling, and the inefficiency that sectarianism breeds, commonly called Christianity. Christ's truth has been so distorted, that professing Christians are perfectly satisfied with the trivialities, the inefficiencies, the smallness of aim and ambition, and the inadequacies that are characteristic of our present day Christianity.

Now, in the twentieth century, what to do in many different departments of life has been fully demonstrated. Why should not this rule apply in religious concerns?

In the first place the physical life presents to us many complex and confused conditions. Yet physical science

has done wonders in restoring the diseased and withered members of the body to life again. It has amputated as well as attached parts of the body. It has made diseased organisms whole again, so that they can perform their alloted functions. Some diseases and troubles, to be sure, seem to have as yet no cure. But the causes of such maladies are often insidious so that their very natures are buried deep in the secrets of life. Through the work already accomplished by the Rockefeller Foundation, for example, we to-day feel assured of the value of scientific research work and investigation. The aims of this Foundation are (a) "To eradicate certain causes of human ill and to build up positive programmes for bettering conditions: and (b) to make demonstrations in various fields and to inaugurate helpful work for the well-being of mankind throughout the world." The Foundation tabulates and classifies the different discoveries, theoretical and practical. It also maintains independent research work, undertaken by experts in the different fields of therapeutics.

In the second place the industrial or social conditions of to-day show clearly how complete and confused human affairs can become. There is decidedly a call to do justice to various classes of society, to deal with industrial and economic conditions, and to alleviate the sorrow and suffering of poverty, and the distress of the human heart. All such is a tax too great, too much involved unless some organized force of human energy and power attempts its solution. In answer to the call just mentioned, the Russell Sage Foundation has been established with a large endowment to do what scattered and independent workers could never accomplish. The purpose of this Foundation, as stated in its charter, is "the improvement of social and living conditions in the United States of America." It shall be within its purpose to use any means, including research, publication, education, the establish-

ment and maintenance of charitable and benevolent activities. But it does not relieve individual needs.

The third division presents us with the religious conditions to-day. In this we do not find affairs any less grievous nor disastrous than those with which the Rockefeller Foundation and the Russell Sage Foundation endeavor to deal. The need of concerted and organized effort is just as great in the religious field as in social, industrial or physical conditions. As Christians we must first learn how to see aright and act aright, but in order that we may see and act aright, our present conditions must first be changed. We must, for religious purposes, be able to delve deep in dealing with insidious symptoms as to the cause and reason for disunity, scientifically considered. The mere fact that we have inherited the condition of disunity is no great honor to our divine Master. We must find the way back to the *"Deus Vult."* Such can never be really done as long as we are advancing a part truth without due care and consideration for the whole truth. We must learn how to make coöperation do the Lord's work, if it is ever to be done, and not to depend upon competition in order to work up the zeal on man's part for the Lord.

Christian unity is not a mere academic question to be considered and decided by the thoughts and ideas, the whims and fancies of men. Christian unity is a very practical matter, founded upon the truth established by the great Master of Life, Jesus Christ. As in the words of another, "The teachings of the Master are not mere precepts to be obeyed, but illustrations of the perfect life to be followed. His truth composes not only duties to be done, but forces to be dealt with." Thus then, when Christ prayed that His followers might "be one as Thou Father art in me and I in Thee," it was not a mere ideal of some far vision with which He dealt, but an actual working condition of life. It is this working law of

the religious life—the law of unity in Christ—and it must be understood and applied in its original value and importance.

All of us are aware that the great characteristic feature of the Catholic and Protestant is that of the emphasis upon the objective and the subjective side of the Christian religion. As already stated by another, "This contrast has been delineated before hand by our Lord Himself in the parable of Mary and Martha— the contrast between mysticism and efficiency." But, "in order to give our Lord a perfect hospitality, Mary and Martha must combine." So it is the combination of these two attitudes that is necessary for a full religion to-day. That is the great object that we have in hand to accomplish.

In the first place we meet even to-day with the false idea of Christianity—that we go to Church or profess faith in the Gospel in order to save our souls in the world to come. The teaching that salvation consists in "getting into heaven" and escaping hell (principally the latter) is contrary to the divine principle of the Church in and through which God works to-day. Then the evident failure to recognize the Christian principles of organic unity leads to a false individualism, which often results in practical neglect of important ethical principles, because, as stated, salvation comes from faith and not from works. Now, although the phrase "salvation by faith" when properly understood, through analysis of the meaning and implications of faith, may represent an essential Christian truth, the usual understanding that salvation results from assent to certain promulgated opinions rather than to the contemplation of the ideal of the life of righteousness in God, amounts merely to a very specious form of blanket indulgence. As expressed in actual practice, it is often quite as subversive of complete ethical and moral loyalty, particularly the former, to the

commands of Christ, as any of the spiritual nostrums vended by Tetzel and his associates.

The segregation of professing Christians into the various sectarian groups is a far more radical and serious situation than is involved merely in the preference as generally supposed for some method of worship or some one variety of Church government. The several sects or cults represent numerous variant conceptions of God's character, and of His relations to mankind, that must inevitably exert a vital influence upon the thoughts and character of persons coming under their influence. For surely a man's idea of God is his highest ideal for himself. Thus, as we may say, a false idea of God is all that constitutes a false god. If any of us persist in holding the notion that God is principally occupied in dealing out his "vengeance" upon sinners, how can we expect to embody merciful and generous attitudes to our fellow men? Such false notions are inevitably hostile to the Christian life, no matter how completely supported by logical processes. Furthermore, if—as in many formulations of the past—people represent God as so immersed in His own "holiness" as to be immeasurably removed from sinful man, how can we expect that such people will not become spiritual Sybarites and consistent examples of complacent self-righteousness? All such opinions are irreconcilable with a proper understanding of the Gospel of Christ. Now it is *that* condition that we are obliged to consider more than anything else.

But what are we to do about the matter? In the *first place* we can use the teaching of the Bible, or rather become ourselves greater students of the Bible. *Secondly,* we can appreciate what the Church really means from the Bible and experience of the Christian centuries. With such an object in view we can intelligently deal with every type of Christian mind. But what is the Church of God from the Bible and the consensus of Christen-

dom? All in the New Testament is founded on the more manifestly practical truth in the Old Testament. God has made but one covenant with man, and that covenant is divided into the old and the new dispensations. Now under the Law a man approaches God as an Israelite, performing the duties assigned to all Israelites, and seeking no special avenue of approach. As a true believer no one believes that there is an avenue of approach except in obedience to the Law. His acts of seeking advantages for himself, apart from the advantages of the nation, is declared unrighteous and opprobrious, invalidating his claim to righteously approach God. Furthermore, the salvation that is promised in the observance of the Law refers entirely to the concerns of this world and the relations of this world. Here then is our background. The Gospel is indeed the fulfilment of the law and of the Prophets. It is also founded on the Law and the Prophets. The words and teaching of Christ are unintelligible, and His message is undecipherable unless we recognize the plain and obvious fact that He presupposes the Jewish Law and Covenant. In all of His discourses, Christ is speaking as a Jew and to Jews about the Jewish Law and traditions. He is constantly calling attention to the community of Israel first, then the community of mankind, which means the grand aggregate of all the neighbors in the world. The human community, the chosen people as expressed in the Old Testament, is the basis of Christ's teaching and is needed to develop and make personally applicable the truth that Christ taught. Now nothing is truer of the early Christian Church than the sign of its fellowship, one with another—the fellowship of the faithful. Now all this was the new and greater Isreal that was to include all mankind—the fulfilment of God's promise to Abraham, "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed."

The next step in the cause of Christian unity that should be undertaken is to make real by our own personal work and coöperation the establishment of an institute or foundation for study and research in the whole field of Christian thought and activity. Then the great truth to be found in Christ could be scientifically dealt with as a whole. The distinct contribution that each part of Christendom was made could be considered. And the Christian mind would find how fit each single part of the Christian past into other parts, so that there might be presented in the wholeness of life to be found in Christ alone. From such an effort there would come a distinct call for a renewal or a survival of true Christianity; and most of the paganism that is mixed with our common Christianity to-day would be removed.

Yes it is true that in our present diseased condition we need not resolutions, however good and valuable they may be; not manifestoes, whereby one part of Christendom expresses the willingness to deal with other parts, or certain conditions, that will solve the problem before us. What is most needed is knowledge and inspiration on the part of the average member of Christ, whereby "the Body" itself can be made fit for the Master's use. We sadly need leaders to-day in the great cause of Christian irenics, who can speak with knowledge of the whole field of Christianity, and be able to interpret the mind of the Master. With such an institute or foundation of study and research into the present conditions, justice could be done to the past, but not without thought for the future. But if we are to have a future of which we shall be proud, we must learn to view Christian truth in its wholeness, and not be satisfied with any one part or a number of parts.

How few Christians of one name understand or appreciate to-day Christians of other names. In order for us to realize the wholeness of the truth in Christ, we must

get rid of the bacillus of denominationalism. We must eliminate the microbe of opinions and foibles of individualistic tendencies. We must learn how to cut out the gangrene of prejudice, or amputate the withered member of spiritual indifference, in order to restore the wholeness of life to its nobleness, purity and strength as is found in Christ and in Christ alone.

From such a renewed and purified condition we could then respond to the call of duty, "That ye love one another, as I have loved you." "Then shall Thy perfect will be done when Christians love and live as one."

The reunion of Christendom means a spiritual awakening such as the world has never before seen. It is a call to preserve what is true in Christianity and to make effective what is in our present day Christian life. It is alone the power that will Christianize all of life, whether it be commercial, industrial, social, or religious. Would to God that we all could realize the truth of the remark and apply it to ourselves, "We have passed out of the epoch of polemic denominationalism, which is a dead issue, and have entered into the glorious epoch of coöperative democracy."

Rockland T. Homans.

Grace Church,
Jamaica, N. Y.

REUNION IN ENGLAND

A COMMITTEE representative of all the Free Churches of England has been appointed to prepare a report on the Appeal of the Lambeth Conference for the guidance of the denominations when they are called on to give their reply. That committee has just met at Oxford and their report, slightly abbreviated, is published in this issue of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY. I desire to describe the general situation in this country upon the great subject in question.

(1) It will be well to indicate as clearly as can be what is the principle which should be followed in all proposals for reunion. It is coming to be now generally agreed that it is not enough to confess the spiritual unity of all believers in Christ and to limit the quality of oneness in Him to the invisible Church, His Body. That body as one is an object of faith to believers; it is unknown to the world. Without laying any undue stress on the words of Jesus in John xvii, as the church exists to win the world for Him, it seems obvious that that unity should be in the visible Church, so manifest to the world as to impress and influence the world. The unity professed must be practiced; it must be expressed and exercised in the mutual relations of all Christian communions. A world divided by class, nation, colour, will not receive the message of reconciliation from a Church divided about creed, ritual, polity. There are Christians still indifferent, if not hostile, to any proposals for visible unity, but they cannot read the signs of the times nor hear the call of the hour.

(2) It is also being now generally acknowledged that uniformity cannot be insisted on. Rome stands alone, apart from the main currents of the thought and life of Christendom. The Eastern Churches have shown their readiness for closer relations with the Western. Prob-

ably this is partly due to their sense of their relative weakness and need of the help that the stronger Churches might give them, and partly to their desire that Protestant missions should be restrained in propaganda among their adherents. In any case their attitude is less exclusive than that of Rome, although we should deceive ourselves if we supposed that they were prepared for any very close fellowship or stood much nearer to us Protestants in doctrine and practice than Rome does. Uniformity as the condition of unity is ruled out.

(3) At the opposite extreme stands the view that all the differences should be allowed to continue and that the spiritual unity should be manifested in mutual recognition by interchange of pulpits and intercommunion. The Nonconformist Churches, at first inclined to favour this policy, now recognize to some extent that while it is necessary as a temporary preparation for a more vital and effective unity, it cannot be accepted as the final consummation.

I. The bishops do not favour interchange of pulpits or intercommunion except where it is to be a transition to reunion in a fuller sense, because they fear that by such a policy the corporate unity of each communion would be weakened and no wider corporate unity of communions with one another would take its place. (a) For that fear there is some ground. What the Nonconformist Churches are exposed to in England is the evil of undenominationalism instead of the good of interdenominationalism. Because distinctive principles have often been held in a spirit of exclusiveness these distinctive principles are being ignored in a spirit of indifference. Young people are not being taught, and, if they were, would probably not learn the principles of their own denomination, because denominationalism has in the past degenerated into sectarianism. Hence their apprehension of Church unity itself is now vague and less definite than it would

have been had they been taught and learned the convictions distinctive of their own denomination. These distinctive, if partial convictions, have made the apprehension of the common Gospel more distinct and less vague. What we need to find is a comprehensive unity which harmonizes instead of abolishing these distinctive convictions. We want not the greatest common measure, but the least common multiple of these convictions, not the small maximum which is included in them all, but the great minimum which will include them all. (b) Nonconformity for its own sake, as well as to remove this fear of the bishops, must make it plain that it is as zealous as they are for such a comprehensive unity, in which all the treasures of thought and life gained in each separate communion will be contributed to the treasury of a united visible Church. Each denomination serves the cause of unity best not by ignoring what its past has given to it of distinctive conviction, but by preserving that in a spirit of charity. Not uniformity on the one hand and difference on the other, but variety-in-unity is the goal.

II. As the course to that goal, however, mutual recognition of all Christian communions that hold the Head as members of His body seems urgently necessary. (a) The bishops have gone further than the Anglican Church has gone before not only in speaking of "other Churches" as well as the Church of England (although the term *communion* has been generally preferred in order that the term *Church* might be reserved for the one body, of which all baptized believers are members), but also in recognizing generally the value of the ministry of these Churches. That recognition, however, is very seriously qualified by the demand that the ministers of other than episcopal communions should receive their commission or authorization by episcopal ordination, so as to obtain "a ministry throughout the whole fellowship" in the exercise of which they would administer a

Eucharist in which all might share in "that grace which is pledged to the members of the whole body, without any doubtfulness of mind." While effective and blessed of God within their own communion, it would seem that the ministry of those not episcopally ordained is not as yet a ministry of the whole body; and consequently the recipient of the Sacrament at their hands cannot be sure that he is getting the "grace that is pledged to the whole body." (b) If it were said that every ministry and Sacrament is defective until the unity of the whole body is realized, and that a reunited Church would receive more abundant grace than can a divided, much could be said for such a conviction. But the bishops claim for their own Church, its ministry and Sacraments, what they do not allow to other communions. What makes the difference is episcopal ordination. Even if apostolic succession in the historic episcopate is not insisted on, that assumption alone can offer a justification for such a demand. And modern scholarship is more and more showing that that assumption rests on no convincing historical evidence, but on an *a priori* conviction of the relation of Christ to the Church which contradicts the Gospel as Protestant Nonconformity understands it. As Protestant the Free Churches must, as a first step towards reunion, insist on an unambiguous recognition that their ministry and their Sacraments are not sectional but universal. We can properly speak of reunion only if we admit that all the parts, though separated, are parts of the one whole.

III. Although intercommunion and interchange of pulpits would seem to be the most appropriate means of showing to the world that mutual recognition, and of fostering that fellowship in Christ which must prepare the minds and hearts of Christ's people for reunion; yet if the Church of England were to reply that it is only for the sake of order to preserve its own distinctive, cor-

porate unity, until that can be taken up into the more comprehensive corporate unity, that it disapproves of those practices, Nonconformity with the experience I have just described would not in my judgment be entitled to insist on just these forms of manifesting this recognition. On the recognition, however, it must insist. Without it any movement would not be reunion, but absorption of partial, defective communions into one communion claiming to possess alone the marks of the whole body.

(4) Nonconformists generally would welcome the ideal of a corporate unity such as is presented in the Lambeth report. That there should be some common organization to make manifest and effective that mutual recognition most of them would allow. As human society becomes more and more organized the Church must correspondingly be organized.

I. Very many Nonconformists, of whom I am one, would admit that, in view of the past history and even the present condition of the greater part of Christendom, that organization would need to be episcopal. We should insist, however, that the episcopate would need to assume a constitutional, representative, elective character; and that much that now marks it in England would need to disappear. Into that organization would need to be taken up what has proved of worth in the presbyterian and the congregational polity. The liberty of the Christian people and the equality of the Christian ministry would need to be combined with the authority of the episcopate. While the bishops assent to a change in the character of the episcopate, yet their insistence on episcopal ordination gives us ground for hesitation, for they seem to claim for the episcopate exclusive functions and privileges which for us at present appear inconsistent with these other principles. Such an episcopate as

would be acceptable to us the bishops do not seem to contemplate.

II. There are Nonconformists, however, who maintain that the assent to an episcopate is premature. The Spirit of God must not be bound, they hold, even by our anticipations; and we must wait to follow whithersoever the Spirit may lead. It may be that some better form of organization than the episcopal may be disclosed in the future. While we must assuredly be guided by the Spirit, yet the illumination and operation of the Spirit in the Church have not been unrelated to its history, the teaching of experience, and the discernment of its men of vision. What the ultimate organization of the Christian Church may be none can tell. What we are concerned with is what lies within our own horizon of fact and truth; and so far as we can anticipate the next stage in the development of the Church we are warranted in expecting an organization which will be, not in opposition to, but in continuity with the past. Even a political democracy must have an organization which reconciles law and liberty, and so must the Church, however democratic it may become in spirit.

III. That organization should, however, not be so complete as to exclude a variety of organizations within itself. The distinctive features of the communions so united so far as they were not inconsistent with a manifest and effective unity could be preserved. Baptists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Methodists should preserve their own creed, ritual, polity, within the unity of an episcopal organization with only such modifications as might be necessary for such unity. This proposal of the bishops the Free Churches heartily welcome as, while it has its own difficulty, it removes a difficulty. (a) Recent union negotiations, as among Presbyterians in Scotland and Methodists in England, have shown how difficult it is to secure a union which involves a uniform organiza-

tion. Wesleyan and Primitive Methodists differ as to their practice in the administration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper and the relation of clergy and laity, and on that account there is showing itself a strong opposition to the union proposals. In Scotland there is a body of out-and-out Voluntaries in the United Free Church, and they are opposing union with the Established Church, even should it gain freedom from state control in the administration of its own affairs, so long as it retained any of its state endowments. Baptists and Congregationalists are very much akin, but they differ as regards the rite of Baptism, and among the Baptists there is a section much more conservative theologically than is any section of Congregationalists. Consequently no formal proposals for union are under discussion. Besides manifest differences, it must be recognized that each denomination has its own traditions, customs, associations, memories as a hindrance to the merging of itself in or with another communion. These instances seem to prove that the way of progress towards reunion is the way of comprehension and of concession, allowing each of the uniting communions to keep as much as possible of its distinctive doctrine and practice with only such measure of common authority as may be needed to make the unity manifest and effective. (b) While removing this difficulty the proposal of the bishops itself raises a difficulty if the theory of the episcopate involved in their demand of episcopal ordination is not modified. An episcopate claiming to be in an apostolic succession as an exclusive, or even privileged, channel of sacramental grace, would necessarily reserve to itself functions and claim for itself privileges, demand an authority, and expect a submission which the Free Churches of England would hesitate about acknowledging as consistent with the priesthood of all believers, and the representative ministry which such a priesthood involves.

Functions may be delegated, privileges may be accorded, an authority may be recognized, and a submission offered as free acts of the Christian people for the common good; but not as the necessary consequences of a theory of the episcopate, which history has not justified as expressing the mind of Christ, the leading of the Spirit, or the common will of the Christian people. Welcome as the bishops' proposals are in admitting variety-in-unity, yet as they conceive the episcopate as the common bond, the liberty of the Spirit is not assured. (c) This is the crux of the whole problem. Nonconformity does not desire to close the door on any attempts to find a solution; but nothing is gained and much would be lost by trying to gloss over the fundamental difference between the Catholic and the Protestant view of the Church. The bishops still hold the Catholic view; the Free Churches stand for the Protestant view. Much more is involved than a detail of organization. To attempt a common organization with unreconciled convictions would be an unreal unity. The relation of the three sections of the Church of England to one another is not a happy omen.

(5) What is the Protestant view as held by most Nonconformists in England may be briefly and frankly stated. The Gospel made the Church, and the Church's primary function is to preach the Gospel, and to this preaching the administration of the Sacraments as the signs and seals of the truth and grace offered in the preached Gospel must be subordinated.

I. This Gospel is the proclamation of Jesus Christ the Lord as the Revealer of God and the Redeemer of men. While it is uttered in human speech, yet it is also the living Word of God, as the Spirit of God present and active makes the presentation of Christ and Him crucified and risen the power and the wisdom of God unto salvation. As Christ's promise of His permanent presence and supreme authority has been fulfilled in the ex-

perience of believers that grace is not an impersonal thing or force preserved in and communicated by any ordinance. Whether the Gospel is heard, or the Sacrament is received, it is Christ Himself who saves and blesses. While He founded the Christian community, He does not stand at the head of a historical succession, to which alone He has delegated the communication of His grace; but He Himself is always and everywhere active in immediate contact and intimate communion with the soul of man. The sole condition of receiving and responding to this grace is faith, inclusive of repentance. The perfect sufficiency of Christ Himself on the sole condition of faith unto justification, sanctification, and glorification—this is the core of the Gospel.

II. As in the grace of Christ the believer receives and responds to the love of God, the purpose of God to make every man His son in fellowship with and likeness to Himself, the Spirit of God is shed abroad in his heart, and he becomes a member of the community of the Spirit, the Church, the body of Christ. While the necessity may be fully recognized no less in practice than in doctrine, that this community of the Spirit should become a visible society on earth with its appointed ordinances and approved ministry, and that not only the express teaching of Christ and the arrangements of the primitive Church, but also the historical development of the visible society should receive due consideration in determining creed, ritual and polity today; yet because the freedom of His Spirit and not the bondage of the letter results from Christ's own continued presence and constant activity, no organization, however venerable or general, can be regarded as alone regular and valid. Thus the episcopate, whether it has or has not been for the advantage of the communions which possess it, cannot be regarded as essential to the Church. With the constant sufficiency of Christ for every community of believers there cannot be

reconciled the theory that it is only by an episcopal ordination that a ministry can be obtained as the channel of some specific or exclusive grace for ministry or administration of the Sacraments valid for the whole body. Christ alone, bound by no historic episcopate or apostolic succession in the freedom of His grace, is all-sufficient to call to and endue with all needed grace for the ministry of the whole Church.

III. Further, as all believers have freedom of access unto God, the whole Christian community is a holy priesthood, within which many varied ministries corresponding to the different gifts of the Spirit may be exercised. Even those ministries which are representative as exercised for the whole community grow out of and are rooted in this priesthood of all believers; and there must be no claim made for them that would ignore or deny that common privilege.

IV. As we Nonconformists or Free Churchmen in England believe that for the progress of the Church under the guiding of the Spirit it is imperative that the view of the Church, its Sacraments, and Ministry, which is determined by the Gospel, should become the guiding principle of Christian reunion, we must stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, in the hope that God Himself by His Spirit will teach us and all our brethren how the Catholic may yet be reconciled with the Protestant view in His full-orbed truth.

Alfred E. Garvie.

New College, London.

THE FREE CHURCHES AND THE LAMBETH APPEAL

Being the Abbreviated Report of a Committee appointed by the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England and the National Free Church Council

When the Spirit of the Lord moves a sister Church, occupying a great place in this country and extending into many parts of the world, to appeal to Christendom on the subject of reunion, and when the appeal is made with the sincerity and impressiveness of the recent declaration from Lambeth, such an approach is to be met not only with respect, but also with earnest and cordial welcome. The subject is a great one, and to-day it presses on the hearts and the consciences of Christian people as it has never pressed before. The Evangelical Free Churches of England share in the sense alike of its importance and of its urgency. Moreover, we recognise in the Lambeth Appeal a deep and grave concern over the evils of disunion, which we also feel. As Free Churchmen, we acknowledge that our concern over these evils has often been too slight, and we would learn from others who have felt it more profoundly. In now approaching the consideration of the far-reaching issues raised by this communication, we desire to be freed from all prejudice, as also from any seeking of ends other than those which should be sought in Christ's Church and which may serve His Kingdom. We pray that His Spirit, who is the Spirit at once of truth and of charity, may be our guide.

It is not necessary to recall in more than the fewest words the circumstances out of which the question, in its present form, has arisen. The conference of more than two hundred and fifty bishops of the Anglican communion, gathered from all parts of the world, which met at Lambeth last July, devoted special attention to the subject of the reunion of Christendom. They not only

deplored the broken fellowship and the unhappy divisions which so long have crippled the work of Christ's Church, as His appointed witness to the world, but declared that the times call for "a new outlook and new measures." "Inspired by the vision and hope of a visible unity of the whole Church of Christ on earth," they felt themselves called of the Holy Spirit to take a marked initial step in order to prepare the way for this manifestation to the world of our oneness in Christ Jesus our Lord. They issued *An Appeal to all Christian People;* and this, during the last six months, has stirred multitudes of Christian hearts.

A copy of this Appeal* has, we understand, been sent by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the recognized authorities of the various Free Churches in England, and the subject will doubtless be brought before their several assemblies or conferences meeting in the course of this year. The Federal Council has no authority, nor has it any desire or intention, to frame a direct reply to this communication. Each Church will take its own course and make its own response. But as all non-episcopal Churches are alike vitally interested in this matter, and as the larger non-episcopal Churches in England are officially represented in the Free Church Federation, the Federal Council, after careful consideration, has thought it well that (in conjunction with the National Free Church Council) a statement should be issued, for the information of the Churches we represent, to recall and to express fundamental evangelical principles held by us in common, and their bearing on the present issue. These principles must determine our attitude to the Appeal and its practical proposals, and are, in our view, of vital importance at a time which may prove to be an epoch in the history of Christendom.

Before entering on this discussion, we would realise that the whole matter is more than one between our

*See The Christian Union Quarterly, October, 1920.

brethren of other branches of the Church and ourselves. It is a matter between all the Churches and their Lord. The Church being His Church, it is His mind and His will which we must set before us to be our rule and guide. We must consult with Him even more than confer with each other. We have our various thoughts and plans about unity: He Who loves His Church has his own thoughts of unity. If we all could learn of Him, we should be at one.

A movement towards union has, it seems to us, three stages; and these must be taken in order. There must be first of all the right spirit between Churches—the spirit that is brotherly and desires union, that is free alike from suspicion and from self-seeking, that is both penitent and prayerful. In recent years a large measure of this spirit has been attained between the conformist and non-conformist sections of English Christianity; and it has been increased by the whole tone of the Lambeth Appeal and by the courtesy and friendliness of many Episcopalian brethren. The second stage is not a scheme of practical proposals. That comes third. Prior to that, there must be a real agreement on what we may call postulates— that is, vital principles regarding the Church, and, still more, regarding the Gospel. This second stage is, it seems to us, passed over rather slightly in the Lambeth documents. It is of vital principles or postulates for which the Evangelical Free Churches stand that we must now speak. This is not done in any "denominational" spirit; the Appeal itself recognises that all the communions concerned inherit what constitutes for them a sacred trust. Moreover, that of which we shall chiefly speak is not denominational, but simply Christian.

Our very name implies the positions on which we stand. We are *Churches*—claiming to be, in our corporate capacity, parts of the one Holy Catholic Church of Jesus Christ. We claim this, and cannot do less than claim it, because of our relation with Christ, who is the Head of

the Body and who has recognised us and used us, not merely individually but corporately, for the ends of His Church. We are *Free* Churches—claiming liberty in all spiritual affairs that we may be free to listen to and obey Him whom we all acknowledge as our only Head. And we are *Evangelical* Free Churches. We use the word in no party sense. But there is, we believe, a definite New Testament Gospel, and this—which carries with it its conception of the Church—we cannot and dare not compromise for the sake even of union itself. This, indeed, is our supreme and, in a sense, sole principle, for it contains the others: the Church is the outcome of the Gospel —hence the importance which has always been attached by evangelical Churches to "the preaching of the Word" —and the Church thus made by the Gospel must be free.

What then, for us, is the Gospel? And what is the bearing of that Gospel on the conception of the Church? We desire to answer these questions simply and clearly.

In the Gospel, Christ is proclaimed as the power and the wisdom of God unto salvation. This salvation is essentially a personal relation of the soul to God—a relation which is immediate, and is constituted by grace on God's part and by faith on man's. Through this Gospel, the Holy Spirit is shed abroad in the hearts of those that believe; and this common possession of the Spirit creates a fellowship in which the humblest and loneliest Christian is a fellow-citizen with all the saints. This fellowship, which is the Church, gives visible expression to its corporate life in common faith, order, and worship; and to it belongs the vocation of witnessing for Christ and of winning the world for Him and thus bringing in the Kingdom of God.

The essentials of the Church are, therefore, in the Gospel, not in organisation. The former is that by which the Church *is*: the latter is something which the Church *has*—and, of course, the more perfectly she has it, the better. We value the organisations and institutions of

the visible Church, and we seek a conception of the Church as large and lofty as the New Testament offers; but we cannot allow any Church order or rite, or even the idea of the Church taken by itself, to displace the Gospel as the regulative and—under the divine Spirit—the creative principle of all ecclesiastical doctrine and practice.

The position above stated carries with it another. The Spirit being given of God to all who receive the Gospel of Christ, so that all may thereby have personal, direct, and immediate access to God, the primary priesthood in Christ's Church is "the priesthood of all believers." But within this priesthood there are diversities of functions, constituted by differences in the gifts of the Spirit. Some of these are personal: some are representative of the whole Church. Preëminently representative is the ministry of the Word and Sacraments of the Gospel.

In these ministries, as everywhere and in everything that concerns the Church, we lay continual emphasis on the immediate and personal agency and sufficiency of Jesus Christ. He is not merely the Founder of a society, or the Source of a succession, or the Institutor of ordinances; but it is He Himself who always brings pardon and newness of life and growth and perfecting to His people, and who still is to His Church her living Lord and present Head.

It is with this limited and non-controversial purpose that we now touch on what seem to us to be the three important elements in the Lambeth scheme which need to be examined with care in view of the general conceptions we have briefly indicated. The matters we shall look at are these:

(1) The Recognition of Churches.

(2) Episcopal Ordination, as proposed in the scheme.

(3) The Spiritual Freedom of the Church.

Other points might easily be suggested; but, for our

present purpose, it will be sufficient if we refer to each of these three.

(1) RECOGNITION OF CHURCHES.

The evangelical conception of the Church of Christ, involving the position that the essential of the Church (or of any branch thereof) is in its relation to the Gospel and not in anything of outward organisation, raises a question which concerns the relation of Anglicanism to ourselves and also our relation to others.

About the recognition or non-recognition on the part of Anglicanism of the Churches we represent as, in their corporate character, parts of the one Church of the Lord Jesus Christ, we have little to say merely on our own account. It is to their Master that Churches, as individuals, stand or fall. We shall only remark that, in our unanimous opinion, without the cordial and practical recognition of one another's Church standing, proposals for union cannot be carried out and, indeed, can hardly with propriety be suggested.

But it is in respect of our relations with others that this question has for us a vital interest. Our members are, it must be remembered, in a wider and larger Church fellowship than Anglicanism is. The true sign of Church fellowship is the communion of the Holy Table. A Congregationalist, for example, is in this fellowship not only with Congregationalists, but also (because there exists mutual recognition) with Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, and others. An Anglican, for reasons we do not here discuss, is not countenanced in seeking this wider fellowship; and his fellow-communicants are limited to fellow-Anglicans. The result is that when a Congregationalist passes from his communion to Anglicanism, he passes into a smaller Church fellowship, if he were held to cut himself off from his former company of fellow-communicants.

This raises for us an issue which is a most practical one. Even on a sanguine view, it is hardly to be supposed

that all, or the greater part, of non-episcopal Christendom—in, for example, Scotland or America—will enter at once within the Lambeth scheme of episcopacy. If we, in England, should accept it, would this mean we should no longer be in fullest sacramental communion with any of those whom we now welcome to our pulpits and with whom we join in the celebration of the Lord's Supper? If we should not continue to be in such fellowship with them, we should be committing schism—and a treacherous kind of schism—in the very act of union. If we should continue to be in such full communion, that would mean "recognition."

What our Churches will desire, therefore, to know is this—whether Anglicanism is prepared to recognise non-episcopal communions (or any of them) as corporate parts of the Church of Christ, and their ministries as ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments. As we read the Lambeth Appeal, it logically implies—particularly by its recognition of our ministries as "effective ministries of grace," and its use of the words "all ministries of grace, theirs and ours"—that our communions, like episcopal communions, are already parts of the visible Church of Christ. But, if this be the correct interpretation of the Appeal, it should be made clear that it is so.

Essentially and ultimately, the question is one of what the living Lord, through His Spirit, says of the Churches. We, for our part, must recognise Churches and ministries which manifestly He recognises: and recognise them not merely in a general way as blessed of Him, but as Churches and as ministries of the Word and Sacraments of the Gospel if He does so. We find it quite compatible with this to adhere firmly to what we may believe to be true and scriptural polity, and to decline to treat with indifference what may seem to us to be erroneous or defective in other systems. But the mind of Christ, expressed through the action of His Spirit, must be the Church's guiding rule in this question of recognition as

in any other. For this reason, we must not be asked to take any step which would prevent or hamper our continued recognition of sister-Churches with which we are at present in sacramental fellowship. We desire to say no word which would make agreement here difficult. But we are certain that the Churches which we represent will require a perfectly clear understanding on this most practical issue of recognition—alike of ourselves on the part of Anglicanism, and of others by a reunited Church—and we trust that the answer may be made unmistakable by being given in word and in act.

(2) EPISCOPAL ORDINATION.

A second issue, which is raised for us in the Lambeth scheme, concerns episcopacy, especially in connection with ordination.

Of episcopacy as a form of ecclesiastical polity we need say only a word. We have indicated that our view of the Gospel and of the Church keeps us from regarding any one form of polity as essential in the Church Catholic or in any true part of it. We hold—as leading Anglican scholars also hold—that no one form of polity for the Church has been prescribed by the Lord. For this very reason we are the more free to consider what form may be shown to us by the leading of the Spirit as expedient for a reunited Church, and we, therefore, have an open mind towards episcopal order as towards any other. To this, however, we must add that we cannot be expected to consider any form of polity which claims to be an exclusive channel of grace or which fails to recognise the place and the rights of the Christian people in the affairs of the Church.

These are points, however, into which we need not at present enter further. The question which calls for special examination arises over the proposal of "episcopal ordination."

We venture to draw attention to one point. The pro-

posal to make episcopal ordination of ministers who have not received it a part of a scheme of union is in direct opposition to the considered decision of the resolutions of the Mansfield Conference of 1920.* That Conference definitely put aside the suggestion of episcopal ordination (which was made to it by an episcopal member), and substituted the declaration that any mutual authorisation was to be "not re-ordination." We, of course, attach undue authority to this declaration: but it was signed by a number of representative Free Churchmen (as well as by many Anglicans), and there can be little question that it represents the practically unanimous Free Church view. We feel, therefore, that the obligation rests on those who set episcopal ordination—particularly in its Anglican form, which is not accepted by the majority of Episcopalians—in the forefront of a scheme of union, to bring forward exceptionally cogent grounds for doing so, if they are to win the support of the Free Churches.

In the Lambeth scheme episcopal ordination is introduced as an element in a scheme of mutual ministerial recognition. Its significance and purport in this connection are not quite clear to us. When it is proposed that episcopalian clergy should be authorised to officiate in Free Churches through "a form of commission or recognition" which would "commend" their ministry to these congregations, and that Free Church ministers should be authorised to officiate in Anglican congregations by "a commission through episcopal ordination," what is meant by this last crucial phrase? Is it meant that our ministers should be made "ministers in the Church of God," as the ordinal of the Book of Common Prayer phrases it? Or is it meant that, being already "ministers in the Church of God," they are to be formally admitted and authorised to minister within the Church of England? If the former be the meaning, we obviously are thrown

*See THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, January, 1920.

back again on the question of recognition. We should not be asked to accept any form which carries, or which could be construed to carry, this interpretation. If, on the other hand, the latter meaning be what is proposed, then certainly ordination is not the requisite or appropriate ceremony or word. Ordination to minister Christ's Word and Sacraments is a general thing, to be given once for all; license to exercise it in any district or communion is a particular thing which may, of course, be extended. But the two things are different in idea. We are of opinion that the ambiguity here should be cleared up. It is possible, indeed, that we may be told that it is better not to press for its being cleared up, and that the meaning may be left to various, even contrary, constructions. This does not commend itself to us either intellectually or ethically. To begin to build a union in the Church of Christ on a conscious ambiguity is not, it seems to us, to build in God's name and in God's way. Whether the Free Churches may find themselves able to accept this proposal of "commission through episcopal ordination" or not, they can hardly be expected to accept it—and they certainly should not accept it—without knowing quite clearly what it means.

We do not think it necessary or expedient to pursue these issues further. We shall add that the whole question about episcopacy, especially about the indispensableness of episcopal ordination, will never be settled by either side appealing merely to its ecclesiastical tradition. Nor, we must remark, can it be approached (as the Lambeth Appeal at this point suggests) merely by "the way of mutual deference to one another's consciences." This may be the right and Christian course in many secondary matters; but it cannot be made a guiding principle for large issues in Christ's Church. If it had been so regarded at the Council of Jerusalem, then St. Paul should have deferred to the doubtless often conscientious demands of the Judaizers. Our appeal must be to the

Lord of all our consciences, and to His Spirit whose mind is to be discerned from what He does. We declare our readiness alike to learn and—what is more difficult—to unlearn, according to what He manifests to be His will as His Spirit works among the Churches.

(3) SPIRITUAL FREEDOM

The third matter which seems to require mention as arising out of our principles concerning the Gospel and the Church is the spiritual freedom of the Church of Christ.

In general terms, what we mean by the spiritual freedom of the Church is this. It is to the corporate life of the Christian Church what freedom of conscience is to the Christian man. The Christian man claims liberty of conscience in matters of religious faith and moral duty that he may learn of and obey his Lord. In the same way, the Church must be free in matters of religious faith and moral duty to learn of and to obey the Lord, who is still living and present in her midst. This is the meaning of the spiritual freedom of the Church; and it arises directly out of the principles regarding the Gospel and the Church which we have, in the previous section, laid down.

The Lambeth scheme suggests questions which concern this freedom in two main respects. One is the matter of the relation of the Church to the creeds; the other is the relation of the Church to the State.

With regard to the former, we believe that there need be little difficulty. We recognise that the reunited Church will require some common declaration of faith, not to be used as a test, but to be a testimony and witness to the Lord and the Gospel. Here we fully realise the value of the ancient creeds. The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches has, in its published *Declaratory Statement of Common Faith and Practice,* said that these Churches "claim and cherish their place as in-

heritors, along with others, of the historic faith of Christendom, which found expression in the œcumenical creeds of the early and undivided Church." We are convinced, therefore, that Free Churchmen generally would be able to give as "whole-hearted" an acceptance to the Christian faith underlying these creeds as do their Anglican brethren; while, as to the Nicene creed in particular, such Free Churchmen as are acquainted with the history of doctrinal development in the fourth century can recognise in it "a sufficient statement of the Christian faith" expressed in the terms of the thought of that age. While, however, recognising all this, we are concerned also to maintain that truth is ever learning new language, so that terms and modes of thought grow old, and, when they have grown old, easily misinterpret and mislead. While reverencing the traditions of the past, we must keep our minds free to learn of the Holy Spirit, who continues to guide the Church in truth as in duty, and who we believe, has yet more light to break forth from His Word.

As regards the bearing of the question of spiritual freedom on the relations between the Church and State, all that it is necessary to say here is that the Lambeth proposals for reunion no less than our principles concerning the Gospel and the Church imply great changes in these relations in England. These need not be discussed at this stage. It is enough if we say that Free Churchmen cannot be asked to consent that the civil power—which, within its own sphere, is called to be the servant of God—has any authority over the spiritual affairs of the Church; or, further, to accept any position which would involve injustice or violate the rights of conscience.

We close what we say on the subject of freedom with a word of agreement. We heartily welcome the intention, evident in the Lambeth proposals, that ample liberty should be preserved with regard to forms of worship and much else which is distinctive of different "groups."

(This liberty would extend to the practice of some amongst us as regards the subjects of Baptism.) We believe that in a reunited Church such liberty would vindicate itself, and that the forms of worship and service eventually surviving would be those approved by the Spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ as most suited to the fullest life of His Body, the Church.

In thus calling attention to the above issues as, in our judgment, important for any candid and adequate consideration of the Lambeth proposals, we must again state that we are addressing our own people, not entering into controversy with others. Further, even where our remarks are negative in form—as necessarily they must be in part, if the scheme is to be tested by what we hold as the New Testament view of the Gospel and the Church —still, we hope that our positive motive is not only present but apparent. The spirit should be more than the letter; and the spirit of the Lambeth Appeal is such a new thing in the relations of conformist to non-conformist Christianity in our Land that we must not lose sight of it even in the necessary scrutiny of details. If the right spirit prevails among us all, it may lead us through difficulties which at present seem impassable and may bring into view new proposals not yet upon the horizon. It is with this aim, and certainly with no intention of closing any doors, that we have made the comments which we have felt it our duty to make on certain points which we think the Free Churches must, in faithfulness to their principles, carefully consider, and, if we have spoken of these with frankness, may we add that we would be the first to recognise that there are also points which our Anglican brethren must, in faithfulness to their principles, consider not less carefully, and we hope they will state these not less frankly?

The Lambeth Appeal has set before us a "vision." It is that of "a Church, genuinely catholic, loyal to all truth, and gathering into its fellowship all who profess and call

themselves Christian, within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage of the past to the present, shall be possessed in common and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ." In this great and lofty conception, we share with profound sympathy; and we recognise in the appeal to seek its realisation the accents of our Lord's voice which we cannot disregard. In saying this, we, of course, are not to be held as committing ourselves to any particular form of corporate union. But that all who name the Name of Christ should be united—and that visibly—is a Christian ideal, which we would pursue with all who will seek with us to learn and carry out His will regarding it.

This so great end cannot be attained except under the guidance of God's Holy Spirit. Along what lines the Spirit may ultimately lead the Churches, we cannot determine, and at present do not presume even to anticipate. But such steps as are clear and immediate we are called on to take at once. Our vision implies it, for an ideal ceases to be an ideal if nothing can be done towards its realisation. The hope of the future involves the duty of the present. In these first steps, even though they may seem small, we must be guided, not by our own ecclesiastical predilections, but by what the Holy Spirit seems to indicate and countenance. We must refer everything about union—even the simplest steps—seriously and earnestly to Him. We therefore ask ourselves this question—What are the things which the Lord is making clear to us as our present duty in the relationships between the Churches, and in doing which we should be following what, through the action of the Spirit, He Himself seems to do? May we answer this question out of our own experience and the experience of the Churches to which we belong?

First, we have been finding more and more—largely through the "interchange of pulpits"—how the various communions of the Evangelical Free Churches are at one

with each other in the *Gospel* of our common Lord and Saviour. Secondly, from the consciousness of the possession of the same Gospel, we have been led naturally and inevitably to "inter-communion"—to that supreme expression and seal of the Gospel in the *Sacrament* which manifests the unity of Christians with one another as well as their oneness with Him. And, thirdly, from this Christian fellowship in Word and in Sacrament, we have been led and are continually being led farther into the unity of *service,* and even towards corporate unity. The Kingdom of God at home and, still more, in foreign mission fields has known new life and power as the outcome of the measure of Christian fellowship to which we have attained by these simple and obvious steps in which God has guided us. Union itself has, in many places, assumed a practicability and even urgency which, in earlier times and before these steps were taken, seemed impossible.

We ask—Is it not possible that God would have a wider measure of such intercourse in the Word and Sacrament of the Gospel and in the work of the Gospel in order to open the way to further unity and even to union, and to the more effectual service of His Kingdom? May He not be calling us to stand together in these things at once, that we may learn together in the fellowship of His Spirit thus created, what may be His will as to questions regarding the character and constitution of a reunited Church? Our observation is that the manifest action of His Spirit sanctions these steps, and our experience is that His blessing accompanies them. We believe that if to the readiness for evangelical and sacramental fellowship which the Free Churches have shown were added the sense of the value of visible unity which the Lambeth Appeal has so impressively presented, that would be a combination the possibilities of which for the cause of reunion, under God's blessing, are incalculable. Is this combination not attainable in England to-day?

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

In an editorial in *The Christian Century,* Chicago, Dr. C. C. Morrison says,

We are all aware, some vividly, some vaguely—all except the eccelsiastical tinkerers and engineers—that we have passed into a new dispensation, a new world of thought and value, and that our problem is nothing less than to create fresh and vital categories for our faith, a new and richer organism for our fellowship, novel and workable instruments for our common labors, and noble and meaningful modes for our worship. We are in a creative dispensation. All things are becoming new. The mood of the time simply will not allow us patiently to re-thread the labyrinthine ways of ecclesiastical history in the hope of finding Christian unity. The solution of our problem is not there. We assert this not because we scorn history, but because we know history. It is because we of this generation have mastered history that we refuse now to be its slave. It is history herself that has freed us from the futilities of the past and has ushered us into the presence of those creative forces that are symbolized by our modern knowledge of society, of the human personality and of the universe itself.

This is no philistine or nihilistic attitude toward the past. It is no foolish iconoclasm toward ancient institutions. It is the very contrary of all such destructive and blind revolutionism. It would keep the past. It would not let "one accent of the Holy Ghost" be lost. It would break no single thread or filament of continuity. It would venerate the past, but it would not be smothered by it. Its creative activity would be in large part an interpretative activity. It would translate ancient creeds and institutions into modern terms before it began a discussion of them as a basis of union. It would ask, not, What did the Fathers think the Church was? or, What did our denominational founders think of the Church? but, What as a matter of fact do we of to-day know the Church to be? This way of asking our question makes all the difference in the world in our discussions and our conferences. For a great ideal has come upon the horizon which the fathers did not descry as we have descried it, and it is coloring and determining all our thinking about the Church.

That ideal is the Kingdom of God as conceived by Jesus. The Church is the instrument of the Kingdom of God. It is a social, human, objective institution, definable sociologically, just as the family and the state are definable. It is here for definable purposes, and its structural elements and activities must submit to the functional tests with which we measure every social institution. It is out of this conception of the Church that the movement for Christian unity has chiefly arisen. It is back to this basis that the discussion must be carried. In carrying the discussion back to this basic conception of the Church we need have no fear that we shall be sacrificing those venerable and inspiring categories of a visible and an invisible Church, of a mystical body of Christ, or of a spiritual instituton against whch the gates of hell shall not prevail. All these historic ideals are implicit in the social ideal, but the social ideal is a basis of fruitful conference and discussion in terms in which men of to-day actually are thinking, while the historic ecclesiastical categories lead to endless disputation when they are taken as the point of departure in discussion.

History—and this is the gist of the matter—has failed to give us unity. Why bother her further? Why seek the living among the dead? Unity is a present, urgent duty. Why wait until ecclesiastical conferences allow us to practice it? Why not let the dead past bury its own dead, while we rise up and follow Christ?

Dr. F. D. Kershner in *The Christian-Evangelist*, St. Louis, Says,

Mr. H. G. Wells in his recently published "Outlines of History" has given a graphic picture of the proceedings of the Nicene Council. He shows us Constantine who, although not a member of the Church, presided over the proceedings, seated on his golden throne and listening to the fiery contentions of the bishops with interest, although plainly without the slightest intellectual apprehension of what the squabbling was all about. The meeting was indeed turbulent. Certain of the delegates indulged in fisticuffs and when Arius rose to speak a number of his opponents stuffed their fingers in their ears and even ran out of the building in order that they might not hear the dangerous pronouncements of the arch-heretic. There was considerable difference of opinion on the part of the Church leaders. Athanasius and his party finally won out but Arius was left with a considerable following. Constantine himself took the part of the heterodox presbyter when his enemies attempted to outlaw him and required his reinstatement. The Roman Emperor knew next to nothing about theology and cared less. His interest in Arius arose simply from his desire to harmonize all factions, and the fact that the Arians commanded his attention shows that they possessed no little influence in the empire.

The idea that there is something peculiarly sacred or divine about the result of the Nicene deliberations is not borne out by a candid examination of the history of the period. The age was one of speculation as well as one of political diplomacy. The Christianity which took its start from Nicea was something altogether different from the Christianity of Peter and James and Paul. After Nicea, the Church proceeded rapidly on her pathway to political imperialism.

The question now before Christians of all creeds and classes is whether we want to go back to Nicea as a starting point for union or whether we want to go back to Jerusalem. The two propositions involve two radically different conceptions of the Church. If we are to have union by way of Nicea, it will mean that many of the most progressive and forward-looking advocates of the Christian religion will be forced outside of the fold of the united Church. Whatever our orthodox churchmen may think about the matter, the theology of Nicea possesses an antiquarian flavor which is out of touch with our modern age. Nobody objects to individual tolerance of the finely spun Trinitarian formulae which characterize the Nicene symbol. The idea of requiring these out of date speculations of No-Platonic Alxandrianism as essentials of salvation, however, harmonizes neither with the modern nor with the New Testament conception of the Church of Christ.

The union which may come by way of Nicea will not be Christian union. It will be a certain type of ecclesiastical unity which may preserve the dry bones of orthodoxy, but which will miss its inner content. Moreover, it will alienate still further that increasingly large group of what may be styled "semi-Christians" who believe in the ideals of Jesus but who have no patience with ecclesiastical domination. This group includes some of the most self-sacrificing and devout men and women of our age. These people, or most of them, will be

glad to get together on the doctrinal basis involved in Peter's confession of Jesus as the Christ; but they will not accept the Nicene formulae of 325 A. D., as binding on their conscience and thought.

Rev. E. C. Herrick, Pastor First Baptist Church, Fall River, Mass., said recently in the Boston *Transcript,*

At the present time, there is a great unrecognized yearning throughout the world that these old and open wounds in the body of Christ may be healed. Since the war, there has been a constant procession of conferences and conventions in the interest of Church unity. There have been extraordinary pronouncements in favor of it, like the World Conference on Faith and Order in Geneva and the deliverance of the Lambeth Conference of bishops. There has been almost no end of printed articles and books on this subject, and in religious circles, especially in continental Europe, there is a discussion of it everywhere, we are told. The desire is not confined to one or even a few communions. You will recall that that gracious and memorable visit of Cardinal Mercier to our country was a revelation, as surprising as it was beautiful, of this suppressed longing in the hearts both of Catholics and Protestants.

We cannot, of course, fail to realize that there is also a spirit of reaction against Church unity. The spirit of nationalism, which is so rampant politically just now, is paralleled by a spirit of narrow sectarian, un-Christlike denominationalism. But just as down underneath there is a real drawing together of the nations in the interests of international peace and justice, so there is underneath a drawing together of the great Christian bodies. It is in the hearts of people and not in the newspaper headlines, and, whatever happens, it can never be lost.

Of course we realize there are tremendous obstacles in the pathway of any real advance. These can be largely included under two heads—the inheritance of history and diversity of human nature. Most of us, who are—as we ought to be—intensely loyal to our own particular Church, are apt to feel as if we were almost responsible for starting it, but we all know that the history of the Church, like everything else, is marred by human mistakes. In our great zeal for our particular Church organization we sometimes think we are defending the faith once delivered to the saints, when as a matter of fact we are defending the mistakes once imposed upon the saints. If we could leave it to the saints, themselves, there would be nothing to it, but unfortunately, the real saints get mighty little hearing sometimes save at the Throne of Grace. When a real saint, for instance, is made a cardinal, like Mercier or our own American Gibbons, it is heard to escape the conviction that there must have been an accident or an interposition of Providence.

Human diversity is an obstacle and always will be as long as unity is thought of as artificial and hierarchal. This human diversity is everywhere except in the graveyards. Among Protestants, it is unconceded, often over and even super developed. Among Catholics, it is sometimes concealed and temporarily suppressed. Some like forms and some do not, some are dogmatic and some are not. Some are cathedral worshippers and some meeting-house worshippers. Some are mystical and some are practical; some are high, some are low. Some are "post" and some are "pre."

There are two things that are gaining constant and wider recognition in the Christian world, and both are hopeful. First, there can be

no Church reunion that does not recognize to the fullest the principle of religious freedom. That is above all else—what America, interpreted religiously, means. You can see the thought of mankind moving toward religious freedom like an Arctic iceberg drifting toward the great warm currents of the ocean. It is irresistible—this movement toward religious freedom. In that direction and in no other lies unity. The coming Church must be a Church of democracy, a Church of the people, for the people, and by the people, and to the glory of God.

The other growing conviction is that there can be no real and effective unity that does not recognize all the branches of the Vine that have been cherished for generations and sustained by unmeasured sacrifices. It must mean rather that each Church will bring its own contribution to the larger and richer Church of us all. This conviction, especially in the Protestant world, is gaining rapid ground.

In his plea for a new creed the Archbishop of Uppsala, in a recent address in London before the Anglo-Swedish Society, said.

The Church and congregation of Christ in all countries is called upon through the gospel of brotherhood to inspire the coöperative life of the nations with the spirit of love and to unite them. The Church must mean unyielding opposition to, and separation from, the spirit of worldliness and selfishness. But, unfortunately, the word, Church, too often rather denotes a frontier against religious communities, and against other nations, instead of uniting upright Christian hearts within all nations. We ought, therefore, not to speak of the Church of England, or of the Church of Sweden, or of the Methodist, or Roman Catholic, or Lutheran, or Presbyterian Churches, but we should always speak of the Church in the singular, that is, of the one congregation of Christ's disciples: the Church in England, in Sweden, in Scotland, in Germany, and so forth, including all who desire earnestly to serve the Kingdom of God.

At the present time there is another division that is more momentous even than the mutual opposition of nations. It runs through every nation and country, and threatens our whole civilisation. It is due to the economic and social situation. In the Gospel, our Saviour says much about mammon. Should not the Christian Church as such have a clear and powerful programme in connection with the reconstruction of society?

In solving these two problems, brotherhood between the peoples, and social and economic justice, there is great need of zeal and sacrifice. There is a very dangerous lack of clear thinking on these matters, and such lack of clear views may either provide an excuse for selfish indifference or lead to rash and ill-considered action.

I hesitate to speak about the united life and work of the Church of Christ in this classical country of the idea of Church union, where British Christianity, with its distinct history and character, has focussed the fundamental tendencies of the Church, and where, especially beneath the pressure of war, the idea of reunion has been promoted in a way beyond all expectation. There have been many exhortations to unity, but last summer the great bell was sounded. Surely, all Christendom must be profoundly stirred in mind and heart by the deeply earnest appeal from Lambeth, originating so palpably in the moving of the Holy Spirit, and marked by the unselfish sinking of private views and differences.

What we need is a new confession of faith. I do not mean an alteration of, or addition to, the Church's historic confessions of faith, but a clear expression of the teaching of Christ and our Christian duty with regard to the brotherhood of the nations and the fundamental moral laws for the shaping of society. Just as, in the past, the enunciation of dogmas was preceded by eager discussion and profound investigation, so in our time, too, the enunciation of the definite doctrines that we need to move us on and guide us is being prepared, not least in Great Britain, by the investigations and reflections of individual Christians and the joint efforts of larger and smaller groups. And just as certain parts of the historic creeds are paradoxical expressions of ideas that Christianity must proclaim, even if human thought cannot quite penetrate and systematise them, so, perhaps, Christianity's new creed of supranational brotherhood and Christian principles for social and economic life must stop at clearly conceived propositions and sacred tasks, without being able to combine them into a logical unity. But our duty is clear, I do not think we can be, or ought to be, content with anything less.

I have just spoken of the Church as of one Holy Catholic Church throughout the whole world. While waiting for this unity to be brought about, as far as it is necessary, in matters of Faith and Order, let us, according to the exhortation in the Report of the Archbishops' Fifth Committee of Inquiry of 1918, "begin at once to act together as if we were one body in one visible fellowship."

For this purpose we need a common organ, an Œcumenical Council which ought to be constituted as soon as possible, and in which British Christendom in general and the Church of England in particular should have a central place. As long as I can speak and act, I shall stand for this new creed of Christianity, advocate such a programme for common preaching and action, and work for a representative Body to act as an organ for corporate practical effort. God haste the day when our vision shall be realised!

In *The Spectator*, London, Lord Hugh Cecil says,

Let me sketch the course which I should like to see the movement for reunion take. I do not desire what is called home reunion if by that is meant reunion limited to the subjects of King George V. On the contrary, I think reunion so limited would be actually mischievous. For, in my view, the Church of England (and, if I may judge from outside, the Church of Scotland also) is already excessively nationalist. I fear that if all or most British subjects were united in a single communion which did not comprise foreigners as well, ecclesiastical sentiment would reinforce national pride and we should become drunk with the same horrible intoxication that induced some Germans to speak of their "good German God." The Jewish nationality is quite as respectable as the British; and St. Paul did not fight a life-long battle against judaizing the Christian Church in order that we should brittannicize it nowadays. I dread nationalism in religion, and I am glad to think that in this I have the sympathy of many Free Churchmen. But if foreigners are to be included, what foreigners? Plainly Rome is out of the question at present. The rulers of the Roman Church do not, I think, even desire corporate reunion, which must be fatal to ultramontanism. But, apart from Rome, there are the orthodox Churches of the East, there are the old Catholics, and the Scandinavian Church and the Danish Church, and perhaps some other bodies of Christians, in addition to the great body of American Methodists. I should like an effort to be made to unite these various Chris-

tian communities with the Church of England and the Presbyterians and Methodists of Great Britain. And I would postpone the question of the ministry until it had become clear whether the difficulty about holy orders was or was not the only obstacle to reunion between these bodies. I fear it would be found that there are other obstacles. But if the controversy about the ministry alone blocked the way, I would have it removed by all the Protestant Christian communions, including the Church of England, soliciting conditional ordination from the Orthodox bishops. By such ordination two great objects would be gained: First, the bishops of the Church of England would set, as it is fitting they should, an example of humility and charity to their Protestant brethren. Secondly, the question of the ministry would be finally disposed of and it would be out of the way whenever it should become possible to attempt the ultimate reunion with the Romans. Frankly, I do not sympathize with or understand reluctance, whether among Anglicans or Presbyterians, to accept conditional ordination. What harm could it do? Can anyone suppose that it would be unpleasing to the Holy Ghost?—which is, after all, the only question we ought to care about. Can anyone deny that we ought to do whatever is not sinful to promote reunion? Or can anyone maintain that conditional ordination would be sinful? Reluctance to accept it whether among Anglicans or Presbyterians seems to me quite indefensible: it is unreasonable, uncharitable, stubborn.

At a meeting of Free Catholics and Roman Catholics in London Father Leslie Walker, S. J., and Rev. W. G. Peck, a United Methodist and a member of the Society of Free Catholics, spoke on "My Vision of a United Church." *The Challenge* gives the following report of the meeting:

Father Walker and Mr. Peck were in agreement as to the necessity of one united Church, though, for Father Walker, this ideal was already realised, while to Mr. Peck, all Churches seemed to have such marks of failure upon them, that it was impossible to identify any one of them with the voice of Christ. Father Walker maintained that our Lord did not preach Christianity, at least, as a complete system. He only attended to the moral way; the mysteries of the Kingdom were to follow when the disciples began to preach under the influence of the Holy Spirit. There had certainly been development in the Catholic Church, but it was development along the line our Lord Himself designed. Unless there was some special channel through which the Holy Ghost could speak, man would not be able to discern which of the spirits which spoke to him was the Spirit of God.

If the Church was to make any progress against the fearful moral ills of the times, there must be one head; even the war showed the importance of unity of command. The great thing that those who were not Roman Catholics could do was to preach the Catholic faith, though they must not be surprised that one result of this would be that people would begin to cross over to the Church that had maintained that faith. He felt that this was all that non-Romans could do, and it was for this reason that he welcomed the work of Dr. Orchard and others.

Mr. Peck lamented the fact that definite proposals for reunion seem only to succeed in widening the breach, and held that the Church might never again be great until there had fallen upon her some scourging sorrow. The present state of Christian organization could not continue, for

it was manifestly a betrayal of Christ and a mockery of the City of God. If there was already in the world one Church that did seem equal to face the crisis, the only thing those not in that Church could do was to get absorbed into the victorious type. But he did not feel that there was any existing embodiment of Christian faith which he would wish to see as its sole embodiment. He was a sort of Methodist, but if he thought there was any chance of Methodism providing the one Church of the future, he would go mad. The Free Churches were not only without any theory of reunion, they were without any theory of themselves. At the very time when Dr. Meyer was protesting that Free Churchmen could not admit that their ministers were not truly ordained, Mr. Peck said that he was sitting in a conference of Free Church ministers where it was being declared that there were no Orders in the Christian Church. Their moral influence was to-day negligible. From the age of brimstone they had passed into the age of treacle.

Yet Rome seemed to have obtained her unity at too great a cost, for she had been ready to buy it at the price of moral effectiveness. If papal authority was just a legal fiction, it was a pity to let it remain the *bete noire* of all dreams of reunion. But, if it was a reality, what was to be said of the spectacle of Italian and Austrian Catholics assailing one another with poison gas at the command of some military or financial patriotism? What was the good of an authority only big enough to boast of having suppressed modernism, but not big enough to save Catholics from being enslaved by modern devildom? There would be little difficulty with Quakers or Salvationists when the Mass had become the sign of supernatural friendship, the Church's daily declaration against war and strife. When the Church was able to call her people out of international wars and out of economic strife, the world would begin to believe in her claims, for what was the good of being a supernatural society unless you could do something supernaturally courageous and good?

In closing the proceedings, Dr. Orchard pleaded for penitence from both sides. The Roman Catholics must acknowledge that the Reformation would not have come about without its efficient cause, while Protestants must see that, in their endeavour to reform abuses, they had begun to throw away the faith. The Lord, disbelieving in divorce, would never forsake His Bride, fitful and wayward though she might be.

Rev. John A. Hutton in *The British Weekly*, London, says,

Undoubtedly there is a danger to the public interest from such vast co-ordinations and concentrations of human power and against such dangers society will always have to safeguard itself—so I am not blind to the dangers that may threaten the great world-interest and kingdom of God from the very bulk and mass and prestige and possible tyranny which would result from the union of the religious forces of the world. The danger of a religious tyranny or monopoly is perhaps not so great in modern conditions, if for no other reason than this, that in the long run the power of such a co-ordinated Church would continue to rest as it does to-day upon the cordial and free assent of human beings. Of course, once again in history the secular authority might tempt this powerful spiritual corporation as in the days of Constantine to enter a compact—the one to support the other. In which case we should have a repetition of the history of Europe from the fourth century until these present days. But that is at the worst a shadowy possibility, though indeed a possibility which shallow people in our own day, who have allowed themselves to suppose that religion is an exploded force, are apt most foolishly not even so much as to imagine.

AMONG BOOKS AND MAGAZINES

THE Christian Unity Foundation, of New York, has established a lectureship on Christian Unity, giving a series of lectures every spring in the Brick Presbyterian Church, New York, by distinguished persons of various communions. The series of 1920 has appeared under the title "The Problem of Christian Unity" by various writers (Macmillan). There are seven. "Can a Divided Church Meet the Challenge of the Present World Crisis?" is discussed by Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, who sees the necessity of being "more intent upon making the Church the *alter ego* of her Lord than upon the sectional interests which have too often monopolized our thought and energy." He recognizes other outlets than sermons for the life of the Church and sees the value of the mystical blending of things seen and unseen in the Christian system, instructing us that the Awful Being raised above the sphere of sense is not beyond the reach of sensory perceptions. Bishop Thomas J. Garland, of Philadelphia, discusses "Steps Toward Organic Unity: The Present Situation." He sees that objections center largely in differences as to governments and order and he discusses five important conferences held in Canada, Australia, South Africa, England and the United States. He says, "The steps taken in the past fifteen years have clearly manifested an unsuspected agreement in the essentials of the faith—the historical investigation of our differences have shown that there is no valid reason to-day for our continued separation; in all our Churches there is a growing 'will to unity.' The present situation in the world's crises demands that we nail our colors to the mast, arouse the members of our respective Churches, and resolve *'not merely to promote, but to secure reunion'.*"

Under "Causes Leading Up to Disunity" Dr. A. C. McGiffert discusses the result of the Gnostic controversy, the division between the East and the West in 1054, and the divisions between Catholics and Protestants in the sixteenth century. Concluding he says:

"First, it should be noticed that the causes leading to disunity are by no means identical with the causes that keep Churches divided. The former might be wholly removed and yet reunion not be accomplished. After division has taken place all sorts of new situations emerge. Men become attached to the body within which they were born and to which they belong. Habits of mind, family affections, traditional loyalties, love of accustomed ways—many influences keep Churches apart, which had nothing to do with parting them.

"Another remark I sholud like to make is this. As a rule the reasons for disunion given by the Churches themselves are far from accurate. Commonly in the creeds and other official documents of the various bodies concerned the situation is described in a way quite foreign to the real facts. Take for instance the illustration that I gave of the justification of the schism between East and West by an appeal to a verbal difference in their respective creeds. No one could get at the real cause of that schism by studying the official ecclesiastical documents. Similarly with the creeds produced as a result of the Reformation—the Augsburg Confession, the

Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, the Westminster Confession, the Thirty-nine Articles, and the like. None of them reveals the secret of the break except in part. They contain statements of the faith of the particular body which they represent and in that faith there is much, and it is well that there is, in which they all agree both old and new. And where their statements disagree, often there is least real difference. In fact almost the last place to go for the reasons that have led to the divisions of Christendom is the confessions of faith of the various sects.

"One more and final remark. Of all the causes that have led to disunity the belief in infallible truth, which one must know in order to be saved, has been the most potent. Whether it be sound belief or a salutary belief it is not my place to discuss here. But I may be permitted to call attention to the fact that it has been without question the one most fruitful cause of division. If, as I have already said, the belief in infallible truth be conjoined to the belief in an infallible interpreter, it may not cause division, it may on the contrary bind men more closely together; but divorced therefrom it has proved the most prolific of all the causes of disunity. If the Church as a whole should ever abandon that belief, unity would be possible even with the widest diversity of opinion, or if the Church while retaining the belief could in some way secure universal agreement as to what the truth is, unity might equally be maintained. But so long as the belief persists without universal recognition of an infallible interpreter competent to enforce agreement, disunion I suppose may be expected in the future as in the past."

Six obstacles are named by Bishop W. F. McDowell under "Obstacles in the Way." These are (1) lack of definition, (2) ecclesiastical inertia, (3) doubt of the advantage of one ecclesiastical union, (4) lack of a large motive, (5) lack of a satisfactory plan, and (6) difficulty of reversing a historical process. And, says the Bishop, "It is because Christ is in His Church and in His Churches that the obstacles to Christ's purpose can be overcome."

Nowhere have there been larger attainments in the spirit of coöperation and unity than on the foreign missionary field, and Dr. Robert E. Speer presents obvious considerations why this should be so, as follows: the magnitude of the task, the needs of the non-Christian people, the simplicity of the missionary aim, the occidental character of our divisions, and our fundamental agreements. But beyond this he raises the question, What is the degree and measure and kind of Christian coöperation and unity for which these considerations call? And to this question he answers that it is that coöperation and unity which will render impossible all rivalry and waste and that which will secure, in addition, coöperation and united action. He then discusses the coöperation and unity which have already been achieved on the foreign missionary field, emphasizing the abolition of party names, the adoption of the policy of distribution of the forces, the development of confidence and coöperation, the practice of prayer and the achievements in actual unity which have gone in advance of the work in the home land. He further says:

"And not only are we to-day learning from foreign missions the methods by which unity can be achieved but we ought to learn and practice these lessons now. Shall not the horrors of the discord and the alienation and the disunity, out of which we have not emerged, make us ashamed of our

divergence? The one great need of the world to-day is unity. The central principle of Christianity is unity. The fundamental element of all life is unity. How can we, in the Christian Church, obscure or qualify that principle by our divisions?''

''The Mind of the Master'' is the ideal to which all turn. Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin begins in his discussion of this theme with the statement that ''possibly we may say that the earliest name given to the Christian Church was 'The Fellowship' and all that it recorded concerning the life in Jerusalem seems designed to accentuate and inspire and increase that sense of fellowship.'' Again he says, ''Jesus did not give His disciples a set of doctrines. He gave them a Spirit.'' He cites four factors: historical—clearing the ground; social—increasing the need; experimental—removing the terror due to misunderstanding and practically forcing the necessity of some organization of the fellowship for constructive service upon us, and he asks, ''Are not these factors in the mind of the Master for our own day?''

The closing chapter is by Bishop Ethelbert Talbot, entitled ''The Next Step,'' and he says:

''Church unity can never come until the spirit of Christian unity has become so strong as to be irresistible. By Christian unity we mean that strong bond of union between disciples of our Lord that enables us to recognize His claim upon our allegiance as absolutely preëminent. The very core of the heart of Christianity is love for Jesus Christ. In the past it has often been too true that we have been adherents of a system, lovers of an institution, devotees of our particular Church or theological school of thought, members of a party, or believers in a religion primarily when we ought to be first of all, and perhaps in some ways last of all, lovers of a Person.''

Bishop Talbot regards the next step in Christian unity to be endeavors to unite the various Evangelical Churches and he cites the plan proposed by the American Council, which had its origin in the Presbyterian Church, and the concordat, created by a joint conference between a group of Congregationalists and a group of Episcopalians. He treats at length both of these movements.

Each chapter is a worthy contribution to the problem of organic union and the whole book is a healthy and up-to-date volume, remarkably suggestive and comprehensive. The Christian Unity Foundation had a similar course in 1921. This will appear in book form later. All such books as these help to a clearer understanding of the difficulties that lie in the way of a united Christendom.

One of the sad chapters in wholesale massacre is told in the Yale Oriental Series—Researches—Volume VII, entitled ''The Lebanon in Turmoil—Syria and the Powers in 1860'' (Yale Press). It is a translation of a work called ''The Marvels of the Times Concerning the Massacres in the Arab Country'' by Iskander Ibn Yaq'ūb Abkārius. The translator is Dr. J. F. Scheltema, who writes the introduction and conclusion. Iskander

reveals himself as a Christian and from his account their calamity was largely, if not wholly, of their own making. The twenty-nine officially recognized religious sects, the pretentions of the clergy and political trickery, instigated by European Powers, led to the unspeakable massacres of the Christians in the Semitic Orient. The Druzes, adherents to another creed, becoming alarmed at the intentions of the Christians, particularly the Maronites, repaid them in their own coin, and a tremor of indignation went throughout Europe. It is a powerful lesson of the rivalries of Christian denominations and the explosions of religious hate, revealing, as has so frequently been the case in massacres and persecutions of Christians, that Christianity had been deserted for political and personal interests under the cover of the religion of the Christ. The book is of merit in that the story is told by one who, himself a Christian, was conversant with all conditions and was a witness to much that transpired. The Yale Press has done a real service in presenting this volume in its Oriental Series.

"Dedicated to all those working in faith and love throughout the world for Christian unity," is the dedicatory sentence on the opening page of the handsome volume entitled "South Slav Monuments" (11 x 15 inches), this volume being devoted to the Serbian Orthodox Church, edited by Michael J. Pupin, Ph.D., Professor of Columbia University, with introduction by Sir Thomas Graham Jackson, Bart. (John Murray, London). It abounds in beautiful pictures and a most interesting historical narrative that perhaps will come as a gratifying surprize to English readers. Associated with this is another interesting volume entitled "Early Bulgarian Art" (9½ x 12½ inches), by Professor Dr. Bogdan D. Filow, Director of the National Museum in Sophia (Paul Haupt, Berne), likewise profusely illustrated. Both serve as a charming introduction to Church architecture in the Balkan territory, especially in Serbia and Bulgaria.

The eighteen sermons in Dr. W. L. Watkinson's latest book entitled "The Shepherd of the Sea" (Revell) will be interesting, especially to those who are troubled about reconciling religion and science. With fascinating and convincing power he brings a wealth of scientific findings to interpret the Scriptures. It is both refreshing and satisfying. It is beautiful in style and devotional in spirit.

In the January QUARTERLY "Christian Unity: Its Principles and Possibilities" (Association Press) was reviewed under the title "Next Steps Toward Church Union" (Association Press). The confusion occurred by reviewing the book in its proof pages. Before the last reading by the committee it was decided to change the title from the original proof pages to the title it now bears. It is a book of great merit and ought to be in the library of every minister and Christian worker.

Another book of the same type is "The Churches Allied for Common

Tasks,'' being a report of the third quadrennium of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, edited by Samuel McCrea Cavert (Federal Council). The full reports of the commissions and the list of delegates are contained in its 419 pages.

The Constructive Quarterly, New York, for March carried six interesting articles dealing directly on Christian unity—''Reunion: A New Outlook and a New Program,'' by Bishop Edwin James Palmer, Bombay, India; ''The Lambeth Ideal of Unity,'' by Bishop Philip M. Rhinelander, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.; ''The Lambeth Conference and Its Appeal,'' by the Most Rev. C. F. D'Arcy, Archbishop of Armagh; ''Unity, Reunion and the Lambeth Appeal,'' by Canon Oliver C. Quick, Newcastle Cathedral, England; ''The Ideal of One World-Wide Christian Church,'' by Leslie J. Walker, S.J., M.A., Campion Hall, Oxford, England; ''Church Consolidation in America,'' by Frederick D. Kershner, M.A., LL.D., Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa, and ''Lambeth and Reunion, and After,'' by Eugene Stock, D.C.L., secretary of the Church Missionary Society, London.

Some recent articles of merit dealing with Christian unity are ''The Perilous Pursuit of Unity,'' by Rev. Frederick S. Penfold, D.D., in the April number of *The American Church Monthly,* also in the May number of the same magazine ''The Greek Church and the Anglican Question,'' by Rev. Frank Gavin, Th.D. In *The Challenge,* London, of April 29, 1921, is an article entitled ''The Ministry of the Church of England: Priestly or Prophetic?'' by Rev. R. Meiklejohn, B.D., LL.B., and several correspondents make protests in succeeding numbers of that journal, one saying, ''If you make room for an article of this kind, it is surely waste of effort to plead editorially for 'Reunion within the Church'.'' In *The Christian Work,* New York, of April 23, 1921, is a strong editorial by Rev. Frederick Lynch, D.D., entitled ''Some Obstacles to Christian Unity'' and in the same journal of May 21, 1921, an article entitled ''The Contribution of Presbyterians to Christian Unity,'' by Professor William Adams Brown, D.D., ''The Historic Causes of Disunion in the Church,'' by Rev. James M. Wilson, D.D., canon of Worcester, is made the subject of two papers appearing in *The Guardian,* London, of March 25th and April 1st, 1921. An interesting pamphlet is that of the Continuation Committee on the World Conference on Faith and Order under the title ''Compilation of Proposals for Christian Unity,'' containing proposals as expressed in the Lambeth Appeal of 1920, the Eastern Orthodox Church at Geneva of the same year, etc. It may be obtained by writing to the secretary, Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Me.

Organizations for the Promotion of Christian Unity

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Inc. Having its inception in the work of Thomas Campbell, 1809, present organization 1910, President, Rev. Peter Ainslie; Secretary, Rev. H. C. Armstrong, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. For intercessory prayer, friendly conferences and distribution of irenic literature, "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." Pentecost Sunday is the day named for special prayers for and sermons on Christian unity in all Churches.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, 1857, President, Athelstan Riley, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, London; Secretary in the United States, Rev. Galbraith Bourn Perry, Cambridge, N. Y. For intercessory prayer for the reunion of the Roman Catholic, Greek and Anglican Communions.

CHRISTIAN UNITY ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND, 1903, Secretary, Rev. Robert W. Weir, Edinburgh. For maintaining, fostering and expressing the consciousness of the underlying unity that is shared by many members of the different Churches in Scotland.

CHRISTIAN UNITY FOUNDATION, 1910, Secretary, Rev. W. C. Emhardt, Newtown, Bucks Co., Pa. For the promotion of Christian unity throughout the world by research and conference.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION, 1896, President, Prof. Percy Gardner; Hon. Secretary, Rev. C. Moxon, 3 St. George's Square, London S. W., England. For cultivation of friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian bodies.

COMMISSION ON THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, 1910, President, Rt. Rev. Charles P. Anderson; Secretary, Robert H. Gardiner, Esq., Gardiner, Me., U. S. A. For a world conference of all Christians relative to the unity of Christendom.

COUNCIL ON ORGANIC UNION, 1918, Ad Interim Committee, Chairman, Rev. W. H. Roberts, Philadelphia, Pa.; Secretary, Rev. Rufus W. Miller, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia. For the organic union of the Evangelical Churches in the United States of America.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, 1908, President, Rev. Frank Mason North; Secretary, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22d St., New York. For the coöperation of the various Protestant Communions in service rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity.

FREE CHURCH FELLOWSHIP, 1911, Rev. Malcolm Spencer, Colue Bridge House, Rickmansworth, London, N. For the cultivation of corporate prayer and thought for a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND, 1895, President, Rev. Principal W. B. Selbie, Mansfield College, Oxford; Secretary, Rev. F. B. Meyer, Memorial Hall, E. C., London. For facilitating fraternal intercourse and coöperation among the Evangelical Free Churches in England.

WORLD ALLIANCE FOR PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES, 1914, Chairman, Most Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury, Hon. Secretary, Rt. Hon. Sir Willoughby H. Dickinson, 41 Parliament St., London, S. W. 1. For joint endeavour to achieve the promotion of international friendship through the churches and the avoidance of war.

CBI

VOL. XI NO. 2

"God gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation."

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than of those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are friendly to all indications of Christian unity and ventures of faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour—are parts of the Church of Christ and that the unity of His disciples is the paramount issue of modern times.

OCTOBER, 1921

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

2710 PINE STREET
ST. LOUIS, MO.

504 N. FULTON AVENUE
BALTIMORE, MD.

AGENTS:
Fleming H. Revell Company, *New York*
Maruzen Company, Ltd., *Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka* and *Sendai*
Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, *London, E. C. 4;* 100, Princes Street, *Edinburgh*

TWO DOLLARS A YEAR FIFTY CENTS A COPY

THE SPIRIT OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY

THE favorite figure in which the church of the first century set forth its conception of the Spirit of Christianity is that of "the Good Shepherd." The emblem which appears on this page is a reproduction of one of the early Christian gems.

"ONE FLOCK

ONE SHEPHERD."

"No one has written more appreciatively respecting this symbol than Dean Stanley in his *Christian Institutions.* It appealed to all his warmest sympathies. 'What,' he asks, 'is the test or sign of Christian popular belief, which in these earliest representations of Christianity is handed down to us as the most cherished, the all-sufficing, token of their creed? It is very simple, but it contains a great deal. It is a shepherd in the bloom of youth, with the crook, or a shepherd's pipe, in one hand, and on his shoulder a lamb, which he carefully carries, and holds with the other hand. We see at once who it is; we all know without being told. This, in that earliest chamber, or church of a Christian family, is the only sign of Christian life and Christian belief. But, as it is almost the only sign of Christian belief in this earliest catacomb, so it continues always the chief, always the prevailing sign, as long as those burial-places were used.'

"After alluding to the almost total neglect of this lovely symbol by the Fathers and Theologians, he says that it answers the question, what was the popular religion of the first Christians? 'It was, in one word, the religion of the Good Shepherd. The kindness, the courage, the love, the beauty, the grace, of the Good Shepherd, was to them, if we may so say, Prayer Book and Articles, Creed and Canons, all in one. They looked on that figure, and it conveyed to them all they wanted. As ages passed on, the Good Shepherd faded from the mind of the Christian world, and other emblems of the Christian faith have taken His place. Instead of the gracious and gentle Pastor, there came the Omnipotent Judge, or the crucified Sufferer or the Infant in His mother's arms, or the Master in His parting Supper, or the figures of innumerable saints and angels, or the elaborate expositions of the various forms of theological controversy.' But 'the Good Shepherd represents to us the joyful, cheerful side of Christianity of which we spoke before. . . . But that is the primitive conception of the Founder of Christianity in those earlier centuries when the first object of the Christian community was not to repel, but to include; not to condemn, but to save. The popular conception of Christ in the early church was of the strong, the joyous youth, of eternal growth, of immortal grace.' "—Frederic W. Farrar in *The Life of Christ as Represented in Art.*

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

A Journal in the Interest of Reconciliation in the Divided Church of Christ. Interdenominational and International. Each Communion may speak with Freedom for itself in these Pages as to what Offering it has to bring to the Altar of Reconciliation.

Vol. XI. OCTOBER, 1921 No. 2

CONTENTS

PROGRESS AND OBSTRUCTION IN CHURCH UNION IN EUROPE 89
By Professor Adolph Deissmann, D.D., University of Berlin, Berlin, Germany.

JESUS' IDEAL OF UNITY 109
By Rev. Seth W. Gilkey, D.D., Minister United Presbyterian Church, Bridgeport, Ohio.

THE PRESBYTERY OF MONTREAL AND CHRISTIAN UNION. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON REUNION OF THE CHURCHES IN RELATION TO THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE 122
By Rev. Professor R. E. Welsh, D.D., Convener of the Committee of the Presbytery of Montreal.

THE CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN REUNION, HAVING REFERENCE TO DR. ARTHUR C. HEADLAM'S BAMPTON LECTURES FOR 1920 ON "THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN REUNION" 131
By Rev. Francis J. Hall, D.D., General Theological Seminary, New York City.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY . 147

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR 155

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is issued in January, April, July and October. It is the servant of the whole Church, irrespective of name or creed. It offers its pages as a forum to the entire Church of Christ for a frank and courteous discussion of those problems that have to do with the healing of our unchristian divisions. Its contributors and readers are in all communions.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, $2.00 a year—fifty cents a copy. Remittance should be made by New York draft, express order or money order.

Entered as second-class matter in the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo.

CHRISTIAN UNITY CALENDAR

PENTECOST SUNDAY has been named both by the World Conference on Faith and Order and the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity as the day for special sermons on Christian unity, along with prayers to that end.

THE Universal Week of Prayer January 1-7, 1922. For prayer topics write World's Evangelical Alliance, 19 Russell Square, London, W. C., 1.

MEETING of the World Conference on Faith and Order. Date and place unannounced. Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Me., secretary.

MEETING of the Universal Conference of the Church of Christ on Life and Work, perhaps in 1922 or 1923. Archbishop of Uppsala, president; Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City, secretary.

CHRISTIAN UNITY PRAYER LEAGUE

(Membership in this League is open to all Christians—Eastern, Roman, Anglican and Protestant, the only requirement being a notice by post card or letter of one's desire to be so enrolled, stating the Church of which he is a member. Address, Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, Seminary House, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.)

[PRAYER for the union of the Christian Churches which was read in the Bulgarian Churches on the eve of Pentecost and will be read on other appropriate occasions with the blessing of the Holy Synod of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church.]

O Lord, Jesus Christ, who like our everlasting Father art without beginning and coeternal like Him, Thou who for us men and for our salvation, hast come down upon this earth, hast been spat upon and slapped, hast suffered the cross and death; Thou who with Thy blood shed upon the cross, hast established Thy Church over a rock of pure worship; Thou who hast strengthened it with the grace of Thy Holy Spirit and hast adorned it with all celestial gifts so that we who are sailing on the sea of life and are overwhelmed by the storms of different evils may live in it righteously in this century as in a ship which is indestructible and may reach eternal rest which is Thine eternal Kingdom; Thou who hast commanded to all who believe in Thee to be in one body as Thou art in the Father and the Father in Thee so that all of us may be one in faith, worship, love and in performance of righteous deeds.

But on account of the envoy of the evil one and the vain wisdom, insufficient faith, and unbelief of men, false doctrines have appeared as well as heresies, sects, strifes and dissensions and many have fallen from the One love and have become as enemies one to another. During the last days the whole earth has been filled with terror, troubles, ungodliness, evil deeds and murders. Enemies have risen with fury against truth and against Thy Holy Church. We recognize, O God, that our strength against the enemies who have risen against us lies in this: To be one with Thee as Thou art with the Father. For this reason we have always offered prayers in our Church for the union of all mankind, and now we glorify Thee for having so graciously looked down upon our prayers so that in all nations who confess Thy name has risen the Spirit of brotherly love and zeal for smoothing the discords and hatreds and for the union of all the Churches.

We confess Thy goodness, we glorify Thy Majesty, and we pray Thee with humility, as on the day of the Pentecost, to send Thy Holy Spirit upon all of us; strengthen with His Almighty Grace those who are anticipating the union of Thy Holy Churches; extinguish the troubles raised by the pagans, and the guile of those who are benighted by unbelief; destroy and uproot their audacity, turn them through the divine light of Thy knowledge of God to Thy saving Truth, and gather all those who confess Thy Holy Name in one Holy Apostolic Church, so that we may with one heart glorify, praise, extol and magnify Thy most Holy and Glorious Name and the Name of Thy Father and of the life-giving Spirit, now, for ever and in all eternity. Amen.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

EDITED BY PETER AINSLIE,
Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore, Md.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

RAYMOND CALKINS,
Pastor First Congregational Church, Cambridge, Mass.

J. A. CRAMER,
Minister Dutch Reformed Church, The Hague, Holland

ADOLF DEISSMANN
Professor in the University of Berlin, Germany

ALFRED E. GARVIE,
Principal of New College, University of London, London, England

HUGHELL FOSBROKE
Dean General Episcopal Theological Seminary, New York City

WILLIAM P. MERRILL
Minister Brick Presbyterian Church, New York City

GEORGE W. RICHARDS
Professor of Church History, Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, Lancaster, Pa.

WILLIAM TEMPLE
Bishop of Manchester, England

NATHAN SÖDERBLOM,
Archbishop of Uppsala, Sweden

ALL editorial communications should be addressed to Peter Ainslie, Editor THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

SUBSCRIPTIONS may be sent direct or placed through Fleming H. Revell Company, New York City; Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai; Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, London, E. C. 4, or 100 Princes Street, Edinburgh.

SUBSCRIPTION price $2.00 a year—50 cents a copy.

CONTENTS OF

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

FOR JULY, 1921

OPINIONS REGARDING THE ARTICLE "HAS THE DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOL A PLACE IN PRESENT DAY EDUCATION?" 9

THE DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOL—A REJOINDER 26
By Rev. H. O. Pritchard, LL.D., Secretary of Disciples Board of Education, Indianapolis, Ind.

CHRISTIAN UNITY—WHAT TO DO NEXT . . 33
By Rev. Rockland T. Homans, D.D., Rector Grace Episcopal Church, Jamaica, N. Y.

REUNION IN ENGLAND 44
By Rev. Alfred E. Garvie, D.D., Principal New College, University of London.

THE FREE CHURCHES AND THE LAMBETH APPEAL 54

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY 69

AMONG BOOKS AND MAGAZINES 76

A PRAYER

O LORD, save us from pride of our personal opinions and the party pride of our own communions. Grant us the light to so shine upon others that we may see the good in them as thine eyes beholdest. Then we shall seek for the paths of our common walk whence we shall meet Thee in Thy ministries to all alike, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

CHRISTIAN UNITY AND CRIME

THE indifference of the Christian church toward crime and immorality springs from its lack of unity. If Christians were united in their love of one another, as members of Christ's body, instead of asking each time "To what denomination does he belong?" if only the one great query was "What think ye of Christ?" then all these evils would be rapidly purged out of our midst, for no public sentiment could long stand up against a united Christendom. This requires no argument for it is commonly acknowledged. Such unity would mean the election of only decent men to office, and at once a chief source of our troubles would be at an end. If we were but one in our desire to exalt the person of Christ as the Son of God, our risen and living Saviour, and our Advocate on High, then we would go forward like one man in the accomplishment of right. Such a oneness depends upon the doing away with all denominational names and divisive attitudes. We are not looking for a sort of a legal concordat, such as Gladstone tried to bring about with the Pope. No, by no means; I can enjoy the very union Christ had in His heart when He prayed, if I at once purge out of my heart all the spirit of denominationalism, and love all Christians for what they manifest for Christ, and if I see only Him in them. Henceforth names mean nothing to me but only the image of Christ.—*Dr. Howard A. Kelly, Baltimore, Md.*

THE PATH TO UNITY

SO long as the Church is satisfied to remain divided, each party contending that its theological declarations are infallibly right, it shows to the world that we are more deeply concerned about theological opinions than about the will of Christ in ourselves and those about us. A divided Church cannot represent Christ except in part, neither can the world be saved except by a whole Christ. How long will theology hold the supreme place over religion in the minds of Church leaders? The paths to unity are social rather than theological.

PROGRESS AND OBSTRUCTION IN CHURCH UNION IN EUROPE

(Translated from the German by Rev. Dr. Julius Hofmann, Baltimore, Md.)

The World War marks an epoch in the history of the Church. Viewed from the standpoint of the Church its most important results doubtless are: A tremendous weakening of world-Protestantism by mutual suicidal laceration of its principal peoples which appears to be continued to this day in the oppression by England of German missionary work, and by the actual intense mutual distrust among the Protestant Churches, and on the other hand the great strengthening of the moral and political authority of the pope.

Weakened as it is, world-Protestantism in all nations, especially, however, in its Germanic and Anglo-Saxon groups, is confronted by a nihilism and indifferentism that have hugely increased through the war and in some countries now by legislature is aiming at the very foundations of Christian education and is about to reduce or abolish the freedom of the Churches.

This being the situation, there seem to result two principal issues as to the Protestant Churches, viz.: Spiritually—new birth from within; and materially—consolidation in an organization which crosses the boundaries of the provincial or territorial Churches and those of nations and states.

While thinking people in all Churches everywhere for some time past fully realized both problems, it is perhaps more the former than the latter that has been considered by us in Europe at least. There, more than in America, the sense of the necessity of ecumenical Christian relations has been disturbed by a war interfering in a more direct and brutal manner with the life of our soul.

Notwithstanding this, even with us the urgent need of consolidation and the necessity of ecumenical solidarity begin to be realized with an increasing intensity. In the following I wish to emphasize two facts, two events of last year which, though concerning Church union in the realm of two nations only, certainly mean a step in the way to an ecumenical *corpus evangelicum.*

In order that the canvas may not lack the shadow, I shall add a third section which will show the tearing asunder by the brutal force of the state of a Church union that in the past had proved to be a blessing.

I

*The Coming Deutsche Evangelische Kirchenbund**

In the beginning of September, 1919, the foundation for a union of all German evangelical Churches was laid at the city of Dresden. A Church Congress (*Kirchentag*) composed of delegates from all Geramn territorial and provincial Churches and of prominent personages had prepared the foundation of a federation of the German Churches. The obliteration of the *summepiscopate* of the German princes by the German revolution in November, 1918, necessitated the reorganization of our German Church. The abolition of the institution of the *summepiscopate,* though venerable to many, it being an outgrowth of the Reformation, yet created a situation which favored Church independence of the Church from the State, and accordingly was felt a great progress by the vast majority of German Christians. The Congress of Dresden was inspired by the new and great possibilities offered in this situation.

**The Federation of the German Evangelical Churches.*—German technical terms in this article preferably remain untranslated. The meaning of the most important ones is given here: *Landeskirchen* are Churches in the different states of Germany, or in the provinces of these states (not, as is often Englished State Churches). *Kirchentag*: Church congress. *Kirchenbund*: Federation of the Churches. *Reichskirche*: Empire Church. *Kirchenkonferenz*: Conference of the Church leaders. *Kirchenausschuss*: Committee of the Churches. *Volkskirche*: a complicated term, perhaps best translated: National Church. *Freikirche*: Free Church.

With no little expectations I went to Dresden, yet the event excelled them. The spirit of this great German Church parliament (parliament, however, for the time being not in the judicial, forensic meaning of the term) showed the mighty impact of the commotions of these last years; but not to its disadvantage. An increased brotherliness among those who otherwise were divided as to their religious viewpoints, dogmatic formulas and Church usages, a profound understanding of the great psychic necessities in these distressful days of our nation, and the universal joyful satisfaction offered by the possibilities of spontaneous constructive work, and responsibility now left to individual initiative—these were the powers that, in spite of occasional relapses in small synodal squabble, kept the Congress on its lofty height; and besides one could recover breath at the services in the Churches and the spiritual music offered therein.

Two culmination points of the Congress may be pointed out: The debate of the question how to treat the religious minorities, and the resolution unanimously arrived at, which, spoken in the manner of men, gave to the *Bund* the safe foundation long wished for by the best of us. The transactions concerning the religious minorities were carried on with most sincere and profound fraternity. The result of the deliberations on the *Kirchenbund* is represented by the following articles, their ecumenical spirit being especially manifest in III A. 1, 4 and 5.

Kirchentag and Kirchenbund

I. The *Kirchentag* opens the way for a Federation of *Landeskirchen.* The Federation is to effect a most thorough linking together of the German evangelical territorial Churches, and to bring about the advancement of German Protestantism in general, in all its branches and domains, acting as the representative of German Protestant interests. There is no thought of a *Reichskirche*

(Empire-Church). The Federation fulfils its duties while respecting the independence and the creeds of the units in its realm.

II. Until the *Kirchenbund* be in force, the German Evangelical Church Congress (*Kirchentag*) shall continue the work of the German Evangelical Church Conference (*Deutsche Evangelische Kirchenkonferenz*) which is governed by the fundamental principles laid down

(a) at the opening of the Conference in 1851, viz.: "Discussion of important questions of Church life in free exchange of opinion on the basis of creed. Without detracting from the autonomy of each Church body a union will thus be created and the uniform development of conditions will be enhanced;"

(b) at the constitution of the German Evangelical Church Committee (*Deutscher Evangelischer Kirchenausschuss*) in 1903, viz.: It acts as the representative and promoter of common evangelical Church interests.

These principles the Church Congress (*Kirchentag*) extends and completes in that it purports the furthering and deepening of the Church life and of the religion of evangelical Germany, in their entirety.

III. The problems which the Congress is to solve at this very hour may be divided in immediate and implicit problems. As to the former, the decisions of the Congress at once shall be valid.

On the other hand it will be the implicit task of the Congress to advance the uniform development of the *Landeskirchen* into autonomous and free *Volkskirchen* by means of suggestions as to their own decisions and to further the free activity of individual Church work organizations.

New problems, the solution of which neither was in the sphere of competence of the *Landeskirchen,* nor can

be attacked at all by them, and also such problems as the *Landeskirchen* may assign to it, may be trusted to the Congress with the latter's definite competence.

A. Matters immediately and exclusively within the competence of the *Kirchentag:*

1. Supernational representation of evangelical Germany and both the reservation and the ecumenical recognition of the religious and ethical tenets of the evangelical Church of the German Reformation.
2. Representation of evangelical Germany and her provincial and territorial Churches over against the German Empire, its legislation and administration.
3. Representation of evangelical Germany over against the individual states at the suggestion of the Church of the respective territory.
4. Representation of evangelical Germany at other German or non-German religious bodies.
5. Administration of and assistance to the spiritual care for the evangelical Germans outside of Germany in harmony with the *Landeskirche* or free organization in question.

B. Implicit competences of the *Kirchentag:*

1. Advancement of uniform development of the *Landeskirchen,* with special reference to
   (a) the constitution and all the grades and branches of congregational and synodal organization,
   (b) the keeping of the German evangelical body national within the Church,
   (c) the interior and exterior safeguarding of the ministers and officers of the Church,
   (d) the development of the spiritual functions (protection of Christian and legal holidays, worship, and clerical functions),
   (e) religious education in all the grades of all schools and the professional training of the new

generation of theologians by the theological faculties of the universities,

(f) the Church's share in Christian charities and in matters social,

(g) the economic state of the possessions of Churches and congregations and titles as far as taxation is concerned,

(h) spiritual care of public institutions for prisoners, for the abandoned, the sick, the orphans, etc.

2. Advancement of the activities of foreign and home missions and of the People's Public Mission, and of all movements aiming at a deeper understanding of the Scriptures and the winning over and penetration of the evangelical people with the powers of the gospel.

The election of fifteen extraordinary members of the *Deutscher Evangelischer Kirchenausschuss* (Committee of German Evangelical Churches) is provided by section 4, which, however, I do not print here. The election took place immediately with the following result, viz.: members: Lic. Carola Barth, Frankfurt a. M.; Behrens, Berlin; Dr. Berner, Berlin; Pastor Fischer, Berlin; Dr. Ihmels, Leipzig; Dr. Kahl, Berlin; Dr. Kochelcke, Schwelm; Pastor Michaelis, Bielefeld; Dr. v. Pachmann, München; Dr. Philipps, Berlin; Dr. Schreiber, Berlin; Dr. Schoell, Stuttgart; Dr. Titius, Göttingen; Winckler, Salsitz; Dr. Zoellner, Münster. Alternates: Rektor Adams, Barmen; Tischendörfer, Berlin; Dr. Rendtorff, Leipzig; Frey, Karlsruhe; Pastor Bernbeck, Okarben; Dr. Scholz, Berlin; Pastor Wolff, Aachen; Paula Müller, Hannover; Dr. Oehlkers, Hannover; O.-Reg.-Ret. Hoffmann, Königsberg; Dr. Schian, Giessen; Dr. Everling, Berlin; Dr. Baumgarten, Kiel; Dr. Schimmelpfennig, Breslau; Haccius, Hannover.

To whomsoever these names be familiar will readily agree that in more than one way they reflect the truly

modern spirit open to the stern facts of reality that permeated the meeting. It may be especially worthy of mention that a Christian woman was elected member of a governing ecclesiastical body.

Dr. Titius's address was a mighty profession to the *Una Lancta*. Owing to a happy innovation by the experienced organizers of the meeting, both main sessions were opened with a lecture by a leading theologian. Dr. Ihmels, Leipzig, spoke on "Evangelical Faith as a Source of Strength in the Present;" Dr. Titius, Göttingen, on "Evangelical Christianity as an Element of Culture." Both contributions did not call for a discussion, nor were they intended to express the sense of the meeting. Yet both were great manifestations and had the nature of a programme. Dr. Titius's task was especially difficult when he touched upon the international situation both of Germany politically and of German Christendom. But at this station he was fearlessly carried away by the mighty evangelical pathos of his powerful personality. Would that his *credo* might find an echo across the boundaries of our land!

"To us Christians also our country is more than our life. Yet even more than country or nation means for us is the ruling supreme of eternal justice and love. God may shatter the very nations which prove no longer capable of being bearers of Life Spiritual which He had kindled in them. God sorely has afflicted us, but He not as yet has destroyed us. He broke the imperial power, our pride and joy, and now places us on a long arduous, boundless Calvary. We are prepared to tread it, knowing that the ways He intends for us are ways of grace and blessing; nevertheless, we whose arms kept the world at bay now are to learn how to walk through a world in arms, ourselves unarmed. We who were conquered by hollow words of justice, liberty and happiness to be realized in a future League of Nations are to be taught to believe that these words ever will be capable of becoming truth. Be it as it may, for that! We German Christians shall mortify all thoughts of revenge, and shall, since

God wills it thus, bury the ideal of military power. We honestly shall stand for the League of Nations; of our own free will choosing for our most sublime task whatsoever the ruling of God has forced upon us through our own history. Who will deny that here too an exalted ideal and a most precious duty beckon us? Germany through centuries, did she not owe her highest renown to her heroes of the soul, not to generals and princes? If justice and love have proved such power even where they were but mere words, how mighty will they be, backed up by the living reality of a mighty people, such as the German! If in truth it should be God's will to lead the world into a new epoch of a genuine community of nations, and if it should be Germany's task to realize that ideal, its attainment would not be bought at too high a price with the downfall of our nation.

"But our own being ready and being of good will can be of no avail without the good will of the world. I therefore turn to the millions of Christians, especially of Protestant Christians among the nations that fought against us, and charge them: The Protestants of Germany to-day, as ever, are the people of the Reformation, and mean to show themselves worthy of their fathers. Be ye truly seekers of peace, and we shall clasp the tendered hand and do our best to fulfil our duties even if they are hard. Only do not allow the instrument of peace to be turned into a man-trap and a rack! As true as there is a living God, no one will believe without penalty that he can keep a nation like the German for ever without arms and in servitude! He who enslaves others disgraces himself! Give back to us therefore the brave brethren forthwith, who still wither away under your scourge. Our people have made superhuman efforts and undergone superhuman sufferings; they are entitled to their pride even if they were denied the wished for success. It is most unworthy, to be sure, that Germans should be found now who besmirch that which hitherto we worshiped as genuine greatness; but it is not any less unworthy that other nations deny to the German nation that honor and respect which are due them. The true Christian ever will ponder over his sin and confess it openly, and in this confession we German Christians, yea the German peo-

ple shall not be found wanting. But it is far more scandalous to force a confession of sin upon another man when he has a good conscience, and there is nothing more absurd than to condemn a man under a law which is not his, and to make him a martyr whom his own law does not reprove. Protestants, Christians, men of good will in all nations, into your hand are delivered the crown of mankind, humanity, peace and culture. Help us to save these precious goods! Trust and be trusted! Without mutual confidence and common labor the nations are bound to perdition. By furnishing the basis for that confidence our evangelical faith to-day is making an unrivaled contribution towards the preservation and advancement of world culture."

It is a matter of course, and it is pardonable, that especially when the speaker spoke of the League of Nations, reminding us of that caricature of Versailles, part of the gathering did not suppress its opposition. Notwithstanding, the confession of the Göttingen professor will ever have its mighty support in the ideal dear to every Christian of the "real" League of Nations, the sister of "real" peace though not identical with it.

II

*The Schweizerische Evangelische Kirchenbund**

While the Union of the German Evangelical Churches, however excellently prepared, still is not officially constituted as yet—the work of constitution in the individual Churches being unfinished—in Switzerland the consolidation of the evangelical Churches was completed a few months ago.

On the 7th of September, 1920, this exceedingly important event took place. The fifteen Swiss Protestant Churches, formerly but very loosely connected in "The Swiss Conference of Churches," have entered upon a closer union in the "Federation of the Swiss Evangelical

*The Federation of the Swiss Evangelical Churches.

Churches" (*Schweizerischer Evangelischer Kirchenbund.*) Its constitution was definitely adopted, and a board of seven members was elected with Professor Dr. Hadorn (Bern), president, and Pastor Adolf Keller (Zurich), secretary. The other members are: District Schoolmaster Ammann (Zofingen), Concellor, Dr. Baumgartner (St. Gall), Professor Dr. Boehringer (Basel), Professor Fornerod (Lausanne), Pastor Ferrier (Geneva), Dean Herold (Winterthur).

Thus the spirit of evangelical union which in these our times mightily is marching through the Christian world has been creating an organ for itself, destined to fulfil an exalted mission in this new era of ours. Evangelical Germany will never forget that among its first resolutions the *Kirchenbund* passed one inaugurating the relief work for the suffering Churches of other lands, particularly their charities. Being engaged in a huge enterprise of consolidation ourselves, we in Germany shall follow the development of the Swiss Evangelical *Kirchenbund* with our brotherly wishes.

An article by A. K.,* appearing in the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* of September 12, 1920, reflects the opinion of Swiss Protestantism on the new foundation:

"Particularism in Swiss Protestantism has outlived particularism in the Swiss body political. The Churches of the cantons were absolutely independent from one another, and there existed hardly an inner organic connection between them. It was strictly speaking their common past only that united all the Churches, for the common hymn book, the examination concordat, and the several collective undertakings of the Churches did not even have the power to unite all Swiss *Landeskirchen.* There was but one loose bond which in the last decades united the Swiss *Landeskirchen* of the Swiss Church Conference (*Kirchenkonferenz*). Its decrees, however, did not find the single Church bodies, and therefore one could not say that there existed an organization proper. In the

*Most likely Adolf Keller, the acting secretary of the *Kirchenbund* himself.

development of the Swiss Church the Conference, nevertheless, will play a prominent role, by forming the basis for common deliberations and common work, upon which the greater union may be established.

"Then the consolidation of the Swiss Churches into a *Schweizerischer Evangelischer Kirchenbund,* this greater union, has been realized at this writing. The consolidation was brought about by several factors. First among them we note the presence of a strong, inner, spiritual feeling of solidarity, resulting from the common inheritance of the Swiss Reformation. But there were also practical reasons at work, given by common problems to be solved in common, and intensified by the intense shifting of the evangelical population in our times. A strong motif also may be found in the movement for union which actually pervades the whole evangelical world. In the past such a consolidation was rendered difficult much less by the great variety and complexity of constitutions and creeds or by the peculiar religious life of the single Churches than by the sharply divided State Churches and by that genuine Swiss individualism which had produced and preserved a mass of original ecclesiastic formations. The cantonal Churches are to be united in the new *Kirchenbund,* founded at Otten a short time ago. It is to combine the independence of its members with the great advantages of coördination, at any rate of a homogeneous activity. Nothing of the existing individuality, or of the peculiar life of the various bodies that make up the union, will be sacrificed, but their strength is to be concentrated, and their contact will be intensified. First of all, the *Bund* represents the Evangelical *Landeskirchen* of the cantons and their respective diaspora. But other religious bodies also, particularly the cantonal *Freikirchen* (Free Churches); the newly formed Diaspora-units and other free religious associations may join this greater evangelical union with which common interests unite them. In Romance Switzerland the rapprochement of Free Churches and *Landeskirchen* and other free religious associations had made considerable progress at a time before the foundation of the *Bund.* There existed, in most of the Romance cantons, interchurch committees and other associations like the *Journées Protestantes,*

trying again and again to gather the evangelical people on the basis of the common cause. In German Switzerland only the initial steps for such an interchurch rapprochement had been made. But it was in the city of Zurich that they met with extended approval and there they surely will progress in the future. The time when the Churches and associations had excess strength which they consumed in combating one another may be deemed definitely passed. These times of ours command adaptation, concentration, brotherly communion.

"As to its constitution, the *Bund* will be represented by a convention of delegates and a board of seven members with a secretariate. There seemed to be no other form of consolidation possible but that of a federation, if independence and individuality of the members should be guaranteed. The *Bund,* by the way, is not an outgrowth of confessional or denominational antagonism but of great inner evangelical necessities. The *Bund* also represents its members in matters common to them in the transactions with the state authorities. In a given case and in questions pertaining hither the authorities of the Swiss Confederation in all probability will be just as willing to deal with a central organization representing Swiss Protestantism as with the *Nunzius,* in whose person the Catholic interests in Switzerland are united—if the principle of religious equality is to be upheld at all. Not a small part of the business of the board will be the upkeeping of the newly established relations to the Churches of other countries and the vigorous support of the union tendencies that during this very summer have made so much progress in our own country. Within the Church as within society the barriers of past centuries are breaking down. In new times there are new duties. One of the greatest duties of modern Protestantism is concentration of power and creation of a real communion."

III

The Destruction of Church Union in Poland

During August, 1920, there were gathered together in St. Beatenberg, Switzerland, nigh unto one hundred and fifty Church leaders from twenty-three countries of the

Orient, the Occident and the New World, among them also the editor of this QUARTERLY; delegates of The World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship Through the Churches (*Weltbund für Freundschaftsarbeit der Kirchen*), gathered for the purpose of discussing in brotherly fashion the international exigencies created by the war and left unsolved for the present day. This important gathering among other things was concerned with the problem of the minorities in the Polish State. The problem was treated with good will and sympathetic understanding, showing that it is impossible to call it the private affair of a handful of wearisome fault-finders, but that rather it is a European, a world problem.

Before the conference a prominent jurist placed for consideration a detailed account of most urgent distressful conditions. His communication I shall quote at several places in the following:

In the eastern territory, as far as it is ceded to Poland, there are living 1,300,000 Germans with 1,860,000 Poles. Of these Germans not quite 1,100,000 are of the evangelical, 180,000 of the Catholic confession; 30,000 to 40,000 are Jews. To this large minority in its totality the peace of Versailles, in article 93, guaranteed protection, the meaning of the article obviously being no other than that it should comprise the national, ethnical (language) and religious interests of that group as a whole. Consequently in the treaty made June 28, 1919, between the allied and associated powers and Poland, these guaranties were stipulated in detail. In article 3 full safety of life and limb, liberty and free public and private exercise of religion were guaranteed to all inhabitants of Poland, irrespective of nativity, nationality, language, race or religion. Article 7 promises equality before the law in the enjoyment of all private and political rights and furthermore the unrestricted use of any language in private life, in commercial intercourse, in mat-

ters of religion, in the press, in any publication, whatsoever be its character, and in public meetings. According to article 8 the minorities share the right of the majorities to establish, to govern and to control institutions charitable, ecclesiastical and social, at their own expense and therein making free use of their language and enjoying religious freedom. Article 9 states that in towns and districts with considerable lingual minorities the Polish government in an adequate way is to provide that elementary instruction be given to the children of these minorities in their language, while on the other hand also these considerable racial, religious or lingual minorities, wherever they be, shall be granted an adequate share in the amounts allotted to purposes of education, religion or charity by the State, the communities or other public units. Finally article 12 expressly states that these stipulations as to Poland have the character of international obligations and are consequently placed under the protection of the League of Nations.

The treaty of June 28, 1919—this must be acknowledged from the German viewpoint also—has charged the Poles with a series of obligations which *per se* offer full protection to the Germans living among them. The guarantees given to the Germans work in a twofold way. Firstly, by establishing complete equality before the law they intend to enable them to maintain themselves in social life in the same manner as their Polish fellow-citizens. Secondly, they intend to protect the spiritual interests of the Germans, viz.: their political rights, their Church, school, language and press.

But how do the Polish government and its organs fulfil these international obligations?

The Germans, in their social and commercial life, throughout the ceded regions are not only restricted and interfered with from the very day of their cession to Poland, but they are exposed to an overpowerful pres-

sure. This pressure caused a considerable part of the native German population, at this hour already, to leave the land and to emigrate into Germany.

I shall, in this journal, however, not enter specifically upon this very serious question; I have done so in my *Evangelical Weekly Letter* Nos. 25 to 32. Here I merely wish to point out how dreadfully the yoke of Polish imperialism rests upon the life, upon the religious life especially, of the evangelical minorities within the ceded territories and how through this pressure a time-honored, blessed religious union be disrupted.

As in the case of every national minority it is in the existence and continuation of their schools that they see the strongest guarantee for the preservation of their language and the cultural body in general. The attitude of the Poles exactly corresponds to this. From the first moment of their rule they have directed their fiercest attacks against the German school, which they found developed in a strong and excellently graded system.

The Polish government refused to acknowledge the ownership of German school communities as to buildings and real estate, though it had been officially recorded. Without considering the number of German inhabitants, even in cases where German school children and parents were in the majority, schools and property were turned over to the Polish school community. In the turn of a hand German schools that had existed for a century and a half and even longer were lost to German instruction. At the same time a systematic persecution of German teachers set in. Teachers of elementary schools, with their being German as their only offense, were arrested and kept in concentration camps, and German teachers were dismissed *en masse*. Such a procedure could have no other consequence than the emigration *en masse* of the German teachers, and thus the Polish method of ferreting out has succeeded in driving out about 2,000 German

teachers, leaving thousands of German children to grow up without any instruction whatsoever.

Which, now, is the position of the Evangelical Church in Poland?

In the new Poland—not counting the Reformed congregations and the Evangelical Church of Galicia—there exist the old Lutheran Church of former Russian Poland, which before the war had several hundred thousand members, its creed and worship being of the specific Lutheran type, and the United Evangelical Church (*Unierte Evangelische Kirche*) with originally far over a million members.

The United Evangelical Church, representing a close union of Lutheran and Reformed tendencies based upon the German Reformation, was from the beginning part of the Prussian *Landeskirche.* Immediately after peace being declared the congregations belonging to this Church within the ceded territories unanimously and without exception, so far as their utterances in the province of Posen were not suppressed by the Polish usurpers, expressed their firm decision to maintain for the sake of their religion and their Church life their communion with the Prussian united mother Church under all circumstances. They were and are still of the conviction that only the condition of such a lasting union they may count upon the retaining of their ministers, upon an adequate and lasting supply of young theologians, upon the securing of their denominational peculiarities in preaching and the administration of the sacraments, and upon the continuation of the existing provisions for its superannuated and invalids. To sever their connection with the mother Church, in their opinion, will of necessity, being diaspora Churches, lead to stunt their growth both socially and spiritually and reduce them to mere sects.

Their will to maintenance of the connection with the

mother Church is strengthened by the fact that the Prussian *Landeskirche* even before the Polish occupation automatically turned into a *Freikirche* (Free Church), independent from the State of Prussia as soon as its *summepiscopate* became extinct—the fact which had been acknowledged by the constitution of the German Empire of 1919, article 137. Furthermore, through adoption of the Church laws decreed by the Prussian General Synod, the *Preussische Landesversammlung* (Prussian National Assembly) on July 8, 1920, established the principle and made it a law that the Church shall be entitled to make its own constitution in unrestricted independence from the power of the State. When the work of the constitution of the Church shall have been completed, which in all probability will be in 1921, every trace of State dominion over the Church will have disappeared. Accordingly the desire of the Polish United Evangelical Church for the preservation of its connection with the mother Church cannot be repudiated by pointing to the character of the Prussian Church as a State Church of any type whatsoever.

That State and Church boundaries should coincide, that therefore, with the changing of political boundaries, the existing Church units should be put asunder, is a principle nowhere stipulated in the Versailles treaty, nor recognized anywhere else. Numerous instances, proving the reverse, may be brought forth. The very Prussian *Landeskirche* e. g., has numerous congregations in foreign lands, especially in South America; a condition never contested. The Methodist Episcopal Church of North America has numerous congregations in Germany and other countries. The bishops of the Episcopal Church of America are members of the Lambeth Conference of the Anglican Church meeting in London, England. The National Lutheran Council of America has sister Churches in Canada and other countries. But above all,

the Roman Catholic Church ever emphasized its supernational character, and frequently Catholic dioceses were made up by the population of different states.

To demand therefore the preservation of its connection with the mother Church in no way spells disloyalty to the Polish State. This follows also from the fact that the United Evangelical Church of Poland expressly recognizes the sovereignty (*jus circa sacra*) of the Polish State in matters ecclesiastical.

The Polish government, however, the government of a chiefly Catholic state, usurped nothing less than Church power (*jus in sacra*) over the United Evangelical Church. On July 3, 1920, the Polish ministry for the former Prussian territory published an ordinance which declared void every legal connection between the United Evangelical Church of that territory and the Supreme Church Council (*Oberkirchenrat*) at Berlin (*Posener Amtsblatt* of that date). The functions of the *Oberkirchenrat,* the highest organ of the United Church, are transferred to the *Konsistorium* at Posen. The president and members of the *Konsistorium,* an increase in its membership being expressly provided for, shall in the future be nominated by the Polish State president at the recommendation of the Polish authorities of the respective district! Thus with one stroke the connection with the mother Church which the United Evangelicals did not wish to forsake, was severed, and at the same time, in contradiction to all promises of Church autonomy made hitherto, the appointment of the most important Church officials was commissioned to the Catholic State!

The ordinance of the Posen cabinet was the more oppressive and alarming for the forthcoming, so to speak, answer to the immediately preceding declaration of the Posen Provincial Synod, and for being accompanied by arbitrary annulment of the preliminary constitution which the Provincial Synod thought it its duty to give to

the Church of which it is the representative. This last Synod at Posen, where also delegates from the Evangelical congregations of the ceded territories of West Prussia and Silesia were present, once more had expressed its hope that the natural claim of the Evangelicals, now part of the Polish State, to a preservation of their union with the United Church of Prussia, would be recognized. To this resolution and to the drawing up of a preliminary constitution it was moved by events which could not be interpreted but as foreboding trouble.

Now, immediately after the city of Posen came into the hands of the Poles the Evangelicals of Posen sorely were offended when the chapel of the Castle of Posen, which had been dedicated to their worship exclusively, was handed over to Catholic worship and Polish service. This was followed by the internment by force of not less than forty-six Evangelical ministers, among them the general superintendent of Posen, Dr. Blau; partly under humiliating circumstances were they made prisoners. The Polish military authorities from the very outset had singled out the Evangelical parsonages and parish houses. They preferred to commandeer these houses for their purposes, even if ever so many houses were at their disposal; in doing so, that not only caused much damage to the buildings but also in many cases the registers and Church records were torn to pieces, burnt or given to the mob. These were acts of personal license, to be sure; yet from the beginning the Church authorities and the constitution were among the objects of general attack. An ordinance by the *Wojewode* commanded the Posen *Konsistorium* to publish the official Church sheet which was mailed to the ministers, in Polish also, not in German alone; while the 1st of October, 1920, was set as the date when German would cease to be used as the official language in interchurch intercourse!

I refrain from continuing the series of ecclesiastical

gravamina. The one ordinance by the Posen cabinet of July 3, 1920, may suffice as a type for all the rest of them. At any rate the Polish *Unierte Evangelische Kirche* seems to be in great danger to lose its independence and autonomy through a government which endeavors to re-establish a State Church of the most uncompromising character and of a type outgrown long ago by the prog-gressive development of other countries.

If the destruction of the union of that Church is not prevented by intelligent and right thinking Polish politicians, if not the other Evangelical Churches of Poland, in wise coöperation, see *Unierte Evangelische Kirche* righted, then we should have in Poland the terrible spectacle, that in an age when the idea of union together with the idea of self determination permeates mankind with power and might, these great achievements of modern civilization are trampled under foot.

As to the rest, the cause of the united Evangelical minorities of Poland, if Polish personalities should not make it their own for chivalry's sake, stands before the forum of world conscience. That amounts to very little in the eyes of a policy of force which continues the methods of czarism—but it means everything to him who believes in the ultimate victory of justice. The Polish leaders who see farther than the noisy everyday agitator may inquire from Americans and Swiss, from Hollanders and Englishmen as to what these countries, in whose history the word liberty is written with letters of blood, think of the oppression of the minorities in Poland and of the destruction of Church union in the Polish State. They will not hesitate one moment, whether otherwise sympathizing with Poland or not, where to draw the dividing line between the Occidental and the Asiatic.

Adolf Deissmann.

University of Berlin,
Berlin, Germany.

JESUS' IDEAL OF UNITY

JESUS was a man of great ideals. He had great ideals for His individual followers. He had great ideals for His Church. One of the greatest of these was His ideal of unity for it. He clearly saw the relation of unity to its great mission and the efficiency of its work.

This ideal is shown in all His teaching in regard to the Kingdom of God. He gives only one system of laws for one body of subjects who are all under one King. This ideal was shown in His mention of "one flock," and was involved in His emphasis upon the new commandment. But this ideal was specially revealed in His intercessory prayer, where He entreats the Father for His followers "That they may all be one," etc. (John 17:21-23.)

The ideal here given is surely a very great one—far above and beyond the present condition of His Church. Is the Church ready to accept this ideal? There are many signs just now that it is not. Late efforts at coöperation have revealed a strong divisive spirit. Steps toward unity have been followed by steps away from unity. The great need of the hour is spiritual. Until His ideal has permeated the thinking and feeling and conduct of church leaders and people all attempts at unity of ecclesiastical machinery must fail. The present need of the people of all the Churches is a new apprehension of the meaning of Jesus' prayer and a new appreciation of the importance of unity, organic unity, to the growth and efficiency of the Church.

The great significance of His ideal is shown by the circumstances in which His prayer was offered. He had just instituted the Supper by which to be remembered, and had spoken words for His disciples' comfort, encouragement and guidance. He was anticipating the agony and sacrificial death just ahead. His soul was Spirit-filled as well as filled with sorrow, and the great burden of His heart was for His Church. He prayed

for Himself, but in relation to His Church. He prayed for those who were to found it, and for those coming into it through them, and the high point of His desire for them as His followers on the earth was their perfect unity. The preceding parts of His prayer lead up to this high point, and thus is revealed the mind of Jesus in regard to the unity of His people. At this crucial time His mind and heart were on His Church and His great desire for it was the oneness of His followers.

What kind of unity did he desire? The unity which he so earnestly desires has certain intrinsic qualities, as is evident from the language of His prayer. A careful study of His words will show both the intensity and breadth of His longing. He evidently wants a unity that has the highest standard for its pattern and one that is very far-reaching in its effects. The following qualities inherent in His ideal are indicated by His words.

1. His prayer shows His longing for the *spiritual* unity of His people. When He prays that they may be one as He and the Father are one He prays for spiritual unity: for God is a spirit and they who pattern after Him must do so in spirit and in truth. But what is meant by spiritual unity? What can it mean but unity in the things which spirits do? What else can spirits do than think and feel and will? These three functions belong to every spirit, whether it be embodied as ours are, or free as is the Father and the Son.

It follows then that spiritual unity is found in thinking the same things, feeling the same way, and willing the same conduct. How can there be spiritual unity of any other kind? So far and so long as the spirits of men think and feel and choose the same and kindred things they have unity among themselves. So far and so long as the spirits of men think and feel and will with Jesus and the Father they have unity with each other and with God.

Jesus wants His people to think the same things, feel the same way, and choose the same ends in regard to the great and essential things of religion. He knows man and what is in man and is anxious for a spirit of unity that will hold His people together amid all the possible divergences toward which the human mind might naturally incline. Different talents and tastes will lead to different lines of thinking and feeling and yet these divergences can be in harmony with greater, broader and more important religious facts. He desires a unity that is wholly comprehensive of all these differentia. He knew that men can think alike on great and vital questions and He was anxious, and still is anxious, that they do so. He saw that His Kingdom, which is a spiritual kingdom, is an impossibility without the spiritual unity of His people in their thoughts, feelings and aims.

2. Jesus' prayer shows that *visible* unity is included in His ideal. He seeks a unity that can be seen and known by men. He is anxious "that the world may know" that certain great religious facts are real. Men of "the world" are both unwilling and unable to apprehend that which is spiritual alone. They must have the evidence of sense to cause them to know, and He wants them to know. He realized also, as no one else can realize, that spiritual truth and unity can only be fittingly expressed in becoming Christian conduct. He was anxious that His mission, and the Father's love for men, be seen and known by that visible unity which is the truest and best testimony to these great spiritual facts. His prayer is in full harmony with that principle of modern education which teaches that expression is essential to the completion of any idea. Visible unity is the true expression of an all-pervading love, and spiritual unity.

Jesus' ideal is for visible unity, because it is the only kind that is *effective* in leading the world to believe on Him and in His Father's love for His children. He

knows most perfectly that "seeing is believing," here as well as elsewhere. He fully realizes the effect of a united testimony upon the minds of men and longs for that visible unity which will be most effective in persuading men that He is the special gift of the Father's love. He understands full well why spiritual unity cannot be known to exist until it has become visible in the conduct of those who are held together by its bonds. He comprehends most perfectly the weakness of any claim of unity that is not manifested, and wishes to escape that failure which want of unity is sure to bring. He comprehends most clearly how that love which is the bond of union among His people must be fully exhibited in all important relations that its full power of persuasion may be realized. In His prayer He longs for that combination of spiritual and visible unity which will be most effective.

3. Jesus' ideal for His people is a *perfect* unity. His prayer "that they may be perfected into one" is exceedingly significant. He knows that various degrees of unity are possible and that many of them are far from being perfect. He is anxious for an aspiration and an effort toward perfection among His people. He knows the power of love, and its relation to individual perfection and to the perfection of His Church, when He prays that His followers may be perfected into one body. In His sermon on the mount He was talking of love in its most difficult exercise and manifestation when he said "Be ye perfect even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect." The highest perfection of the individual, or of the Church, is to be found in that spirit of unity which true love is sure to bring. Any claims of perfection in which love is wanting are false and pharisaic. "Love is the fulfilling of the law."

When Jesus held up this ideal in His prayer for unity, He knew the sinful bent of human nature, and foresaw that many imperfections and failures in regard to unity

would arise. He knew also that many would accept and defend as sufficient a unity far short of His ideal. But He wanted His followers to have the right ideal, and knew that the Holy Spirit sent by Him would be ever seeking to inspire this ideal in the minds and hearts of those belonging to His Church and concerned with its affairs. He fully fathomed the meaning of perfection and longed for that degree of it which would be a true and perceptible imitation of the oneness of the Father and Himself. Yes, He knew the power of love to make unity perfect through its reconciliation and harmonization of the differences which will arise among His followers, and the victories which it will gain over pride, selfishness and sinful ambitions. He was very solicitous for that perfect unity which can be realized only by the most perfect visible organic unity, especially of the Church's ecclesiastical machinery.

What kind of unity do we have? Our consideration of Jesus' ideal calls for an examination of the kind of unity now in reality existing. It prompts the inquiry, How far does this unity conform to His ideal?

1. There is much spiritual unity among the Churches. It is evident to every one that we think the same things, feel the same emotions and choose the same ends in regard to a large number of religious facts. Now these common beliefs, emotions and aims in religious things determine the existence and amount of spiritual unity there is among the Churches. It is idle to imagine that there is any spiritual unity that transcends the action of man's spirits in thinking, feeling and willing alike. We can conceive of no spiritual unity except where the natural and recognized activities of spirits are functioning in harmony with one another. In so far as it is possible to know exactly how far the people of the Churches are alike in their thoughts, desires and aims, it is not difficult to determine the exact amount of spiritual unity

there is among the Churches. But this can be done only so far as the harmonious activities of their spirits are manifested by their visible conduct. It follows therefore that there cannot be much greater spiritual unity among the Churches than there is of unity that is visible. But

2. There is much visible unity among the Churches. It is seen in the expressed beliefs, or testimonies of the various Churches. Even those widest apart hold many things in common. Those most alike hold very largely to the same beliefs. It is seen also in the similarity of emotions with which the people of all denominations regard religious things. The love and devotion of Christian people to great spiritual truths and facts and to Church affairs in general are very much alike in all denominations. The aims and purposes of all Christian people are essentially the same, and the modes and methods of their activities very much alike. Worship is rendered in a very similar way, and the affairs of Church administered very similarly in most points and the same ends gained whether any particular body of Christians be Episcopal, Presbyterian or Congregational.

In addition to these facts a number of interchurch organizations bring the people of the various Churches together along special lines of Christian effort. The growing number of these movements and the wide and deep interest of the Churches generally in them surely indicate the working of the Spirit toward the unification of the Churches. It is well to remember that in this work the Spirit has to deal with people who like to have their own way as to how it shall be done and how far it shall go. Nevertheless He has stirred the hearts of multitudes in this direction, and has made evident in many ways the value and power of coöperation as a great step in the right direction.

All efforts at coöperation are approaches toward organic union. Their value depends upon the range and

degree of unity secured. Some of them have done, and are doing, great things and indicate by their results what could be done by a more perfect unity.

3. We do not have a unity that has *been perfected.* Many of us would say that it is still far from it. No other proof of its imperfection is needed than the two hundred, and more, denominations in America, largely independent of each other, with all their envies, jealousies, suspicions and dislikes of one another. No one of broad experience can deny that these antipathies exist and are often very keen and that cross-purposes hinder the best work. The Church of Christ will not "be perfected into one" until its ecclesiastical machinery, as well as other features, has been completely unified. But this visible unity will not be hard to gain when spiritual unity has once been perfected. It is very evident that the spiritual unity of the Churches is still defective, for it is inherent in spiritual unity to express itself in the visible conduct of men. So true is this that men of the world are not willing to give credit for any claims of unity until it can be seen. They are so sure that if it really exists it will make itself manifest.

This inherent quality of spiritual unity makes it, when it is enlarged, soon to begin to manifest its greater existence by some movement in the line of greater visible unity. That spiritual unity has been increasing considerably these later years is evident from the new manifestations of unity that have arisen. The Holy Spirit has been instilling thoughts, feelings and aims along the line of unity, and although His voice may have been heard imperfectly, it has been heard clearly enough to make certain movements possible, and to secure through them much evidence on the value and importance of united aim and action. These movements have had their real successes along those lines where spiritual unity made it most possible, and gained abiding results only so far

as spiritual unity had reached. It has been shown that the Churches are ready for coöperation along certain limited lines, and that much good has been accomplished, and much will yet be accomplished, by such coöperation as the Churches are ready to accept. The results that have been gained ought to give a new vision to the Churches of what is possible when a more perfect unity and its inherent coöperation has been established through their more perfect union into one body.

The possible results from that kind and degree of coöperation which perfect unity would bring are very great. What great economies would be secured! How much more truly democratic the Church would become! What strength for mighty tasks would be insured! What mountain peaks of prejudice would be obliterated! What great steps in religious education could be taken! What increasing power to the gospel message would be gained! What greater diversities of work could be undertaken and made effective! What rightful preeminence could be given to those virtues and graces which make perfection in Christian character! Such possibilities are worth thinking about and worth a great effort to secure, and these are only a few of them.

What can be done with this ideal? Late movements have clearly shown that the Churches are not yet ready for organic union, and to be rather shy of any open step toward that visible unity through which this ideal can be fully realized. And yet that this is the true ideal and the one that ought to be the inspiration of all the Churches is recognized even by those opposed to all considerations of organic unity. The highest count of one of the most conservative of Churches in a resolution relating to this great ideal, says: "Whether we must look forward a decade, a century, or a thousand years, it is blessed to look." But the blessedness of looking can be found only in the effort to attain. What then can be done to make this looking real and effective?

1. We can think more deeply and rightly about this ideal than we have been doing. Many of us have not been thinking much about it, and what we have thought has been mostly against it and therefore wrong. In Bible reading and study we have not often turned to John seventeenth to meditate on Jesus' prayer and to be deeply impressed with His most earnest desire. Indeed this ideal has seemed to us too impossible, or too remote, to think much about. But it is well to remember that all great ideals are considered impossible, impracticable and very remote by most people in certain stages of their growth. Earnest thinking and careful effort by a few are sure to work a change. The impossible becomes possible and the remote becomes imminent as the vision grows.

Moreover, is it not too true that we have not cared to think much about it, because our personal tastes and apparent interests did not seem to favor it? We have grown up thinking the divided condition of the Church to be natural, necessary and abiding, and have thought of Jesus' ideal as for a very distant future, or perhaps only for the future world. We have been told so often that an army has many divisions and that the vine has many branches and that the Church is like an army, or a vine, in its divided state, and we have accepted these ideas as right ideas. The writer confesses that he was more than twenty-five years in the ministry before he had given this prayer of Jesus for unity such careful thought as it deserves. He had heard and accepted the common defenses of our divisions, and had himself used these arguments and defenses. New circumstances demanded of him a new consideration of Jesus' ideal as indicated by His prayer and kept him thinking until a new vision of its meaning became clear and strong and gained that place in his thoughts, desires and purposes which he believes it deserves. He now sees that it is worthy of a

very high place in the thinking of all the followers of Jesus. It is big enough an ideal when developed by serious, frequent and submissive meditation, to fill the souls of men with great longing for its consummation, and readiness for any fitting step that will hasten its approach.

2. We can use more frequently than we have been doing the prayer of Jesus for unity. Such praying will be helpful to our thinking. It will help us penetrate and fully understand the heart of Jesus when He prayed this prayer. We have not been praying much along this line and there is a reason for it. We have not very much wanted the ideal of Jesus to be realized. We have enjoyed our associations with some particular group of Church people, and are pleased with the class distinction which it brings. Sectarian pride has rather a deep hold upon our hearts, and prejudices against other denominations are rather strong. We can pray with zest for "our beloved Zion," but have too few longings for the whole body of Christ. It is well to remember that Jesus' prayer for unity is as much the Lord's prayer as the one so named and is just as worthy of frequent and general use. Such use would help us understand and appreciate how the coming of the Kingdom prayed for in the other is to be realized. Our praying for its coming will be much better praying when His plan for its coming is clearly recognized and frequently expressed.

3. We can be open-minded in regard to this ideal. The times demand this state of mind. The Holy Spirit is stirring the minds of many with a vision of its importance. Efforts to suppress this ideal have come to nought, while at the same time its value has been more fully shown. It is a question that cannot remain suppressed, or be indefinitely postponed. It is beginning now to demand the attention which it rightly deserves. To cherish a closed mind in regard to its full and free consideration

is surely a great sin. The Jews of Jesus' time had ears to hear but would not hear, and we cannot be like them and be without much sin.

This ideal is worthy of much consideration because we are brethren. Such consideration ought to be charitable, broad and thorough. It must go forward under the dominion of a genuine Christian love, or it will not be according to His plan and must fail in its objective. It should examine the subject anew and thoroughly from every standpoint. It should make the proper estimate of all the hindrances to the realization of this ideal and of all the impelling forces that are urging it forward to its full realization. This consideration should proceed in a spirit of complete submission to the will of Jesus, a ruling purpose to execute His plan and a deep sense of Christian brotherhood. A friendly, frank and full discussion of this ideal would do all the Churches great good. Done in the right spirit, it will stimulate and strengthen that kind of thinking, feeling and choosing toward one another that will greatly increase our spiritual unity, the most essential step at present in reaching more visible and more perfect unity.

4. We can make this ideal immanent in our thinking, praying, and working for the coming of Christ's Kingdom. We have believed somewhat in this ideal, but have thought of it, and may still be thinking of it, as something far, far away. So we thought of prohibition a very few years ago. But prohibition is here, thanks to that small group of temperance workers who believingly and persistently filled the Churches with its propaganda. This ideal of Jesus is worthy of a similar immanence. It is worthy of such an immanence as is being stressed on Christ's second coming. His coming as the exalted Saviour of mankind surely involves the perfected oneness of His people. The nearness of this ideal depends in no small degree upon the earnest thoughts, desires and ef-

forts of Christian people in regard to it. We can help forward its realization by thinking of it as near at hand.

5. We can recognize and testify against the evil of divisive courses. If this ideal of Jesus is the true one, divisive thinking, aims and efforts are very wrong, and ought to be avoided and condemned. They are wrong, too, because they are contrary to that love which suffereth long and is kind. Pride, and not love, is the instigator and promoter of such evil courses. They are wrong, too, because they are a resort to a wrong kind of force to gain some selfish ascendency in a struggle where unselfishness should reign. Many a good cause, whatever apparent success it may seem to have gained, has been actually degraded and seriously injured by the divisive teaching and efforts of its supporters. Truth had better meet error in the open field than trust in the closed fortifications of a separate organization, if its character as truth is to be fully shown and vindicated. A spirit of divisiveness among those who claim to be the followers of Jesus is very contrary to the spirit and purpose of His prayer. It ought to be discouraged and overcome by the ruling power of a genuine Christian love. It vitiates the righteousness of any cause in which it is conspicuous.

Such things as these can well be done in the promotion of this ideal and may now fittingly receive our earnest attention. Such things are very necessary before any special steps toward organic union can be successfully undertaken and accomplished. These things will help to produce that spiritual condition which is fundamental to all future progress toward organic unity. Surely the Holy Spirit is striving with the people of the Churches to move forward along these lines. He is calling for such a charitable consideration of this ideal of Jesus, and such a propaganda in regard to its great longing, as will bring the Churches into that condition of spiritual concord which in itself will be an incomprehensible blessing,

and which will soon make itself manifest in a visible unity that is reaching toward perfection.

The effort of the Holy Spirit to impress this ideal of Jesus upon His Church is surely to be seen in the various movements toward unity that have arisen within the last few years. Such approaches toward unity as have been made by the Federal Council, the Faith and Order Conference, the American Council on Organic Union, the Concordat, and the Interchurch World Movement are significant and must have a cause that is fully sufficient for their existence. The spirit and appeal of the great conferences held this last summer in London, England, and in Geneva, Switzerland, when forty nations and eighty denominations were represented, give strong evidence that the Spirit of Jesus has been working in the minds and hearts of Christian men all around the world. The large place which subjects relating to this ideal are gaining in the religious press of to-day and the number of new books appearing in support of its claims are also evidences that Jesus' Spirit is moving on the minds, hearts, and wills of many of His people in the promotion of this ideal. Who can doubt that the Holy Spirit has been, and now is at work in the effort to persuade the followers of Jesus in all the churches that His ideal of unity for His Church is the only true one and absolutely necessary to the right fulfilment of its mission?

Seth W. Gilkey.

Manse United Presbyterian Church,
Bridgeport, Ohio.

THE PRESBYTERY OF MONTREAL AND CHRISTIAN UNION

Report of the Committee on Reunion of the Churches in Relation to The Lambeth Conference

Submitted to and Received by the Presbytery at its Meeting on the 20th *May,* 1921*

The Presbytery of Montreal, at its meeting in November, last, passed resolutions paying honour to the friendly spirit of the Lambeth "Appeal to All Christian People," sharing the earnest desire of the Lambeth Conference for increasing unity among Christian Churches and for well-considered methods of approach thereto, and expressing readiness to enter into conference on the subject with authorities of the Anglican communion. The Presbytery agreed to "transmit these resolutions to the next meeting of the General Assembly, respectfully requesting it to take the whole matter into its consideration."

Subsequently the Presbytery appointed a committee to meet and confer with any similar committee appointed by the Bishop of the diocese of Montreal.

That committee has satisfaction in now submitting its report to the Presbytery, and first presents the joint report of conferences between the Presbyterian and the Anglican committees.

I

First is the report of the conferences between the committee of the Presbytery of Montreal on the Reunion of the Churches in relation to the Lambeth Conference and a similar committee appointed by the Bishop of Montreal.

Following is a list of the members of the two committees:—1. Presbyterian: Chairman, Rev. Professor

*Unanimously adopted by the Presbytery at its stated meeting June 28, 1921.

Welsh, Principal Fraser, Professor A. R. Gordon, Rev. Dr. Clark, Rev. Dr. Dickie, Rev. Dr. Duncan, Rev. Dr. Hanson, Rev. A. G. McKinnon, Rev. J. B. Maclean, Rev. S. T. Martin, Rev. E. J. Rattee, Rev. A. S. Ross, Dr. G. A. Berwick, Mr. W. S Leslie, Dr D. A. Murray, Mr. James Rodger.

2. Anglican: Chairman, The Bishop of Montreal, Archdeacon Paterson-Smyth, Canon Rexford, Canon Horsey, Canon Willis, Canon Shatford, Canon Almond, Rev. Dr. Abbott-Smith, Rev. Dr. Howard, Rev. J. E. Fee, Rev. W. H. Davison, Rev. A. H. Moore, Rev. R. K. Taylor, Rev. R. Y. Overing, Chancellor Davidson, Professor H. A. Smith.

The conference was organized under the joint chairmanship of Bishop Farthing and Professor Welsh, and Dr. D. A. Murray and Dr. O. W. Howard were appointed joint secretaries.

There were five conferences held, on the following dates: Jan. 28th, Feb. 11th, March 4th, May 17th and May 20th.

It having been agreed to consider first questions of Faith and then to pass to the Subject of Order, the following resolutions were successively adopted by the conference:—

I. Faith

That the Lambeth Statement represents the view of this conference, namely:—

"We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of:—

"The Holy Scriptures, as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the baptismal confession of belief:—

"The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and

the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with Christ.

"A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body." (*Lambeth Report, p.* 28, *Sec. VI.*)

II. Order

The following resolutions, dealing with Sections VII and VIII, pp. 28 and 29, were adopted:—

1. In view of the ultimate ideal of a reunited Christendom, a representative and constitutional episcopate, coördinated with Synodical, Presbyterial and Congregational representation, is adapted to the achievement of the larger unity.

(At the third conference the following resolution was submitted, but not formally adopted. A joint sub-committee was appointed to deal with the same, the text of which is here given as it formed the basis for subsequent discussion and action:—

"In view of any action involving union between the Anglican and Presbyterian communions, bishops and clergy of the Anglican communion would accept a form of Presbyterial commission, and ministers of the Presbyterian communion would accept a form of Episcopal commission. Any who at the time of union may not desire to receive such a commission, entitling them to officiate at all acts of worship in the united Church, would retain their present status and functions."—*Compare Lambeth Report, p.* 143).

After several meetings both of the joint sub-committee and of the separate committees, the joint committee submitted to the fourth conference the following forms of reciprocal commission, which, after amendment, were adopted in the following form:—

1. Presbyterian Form of Commission to Anglicans

A declaration will be made to the effect that there is no repudiation of or reflection on the ministry to which we have been set apart by the Holy Spirit, but that the authorization is given to enable us to exercise the ministry in a wider sphere within the re-united Church. The exact phraseology of this has not been determined.

Then the clergy of the Church of England will be admitted according to the form in the "Draft of the Book of Common Order of the Presbyterian Church in Canada," pp. 35, 36, as follows:—

Now may be sung "Come, Holy Ghost, our souls inspire," or other hymn of supplication for the presence of the Holy Spirit. Then shall the Candidate kneel, and, other Presbyters standing about him, the Moderator shall say:—Since no man is of himself sufficient for these things, let us call upon God in prayer.

Let us Pray

Almighty and most merciful Father, who of Thine infinite goodness hast given Thine only Son, Jesus Christ, to be our Redeemer and the Author of eternal life; and hast exalted Him unto Thy right hand, from whence, according to Thy will, He hath sent down the Holy Ghost and given gifts unto men, send down, we pray Thee, the Holy Ghost upon this Thy servant, whom, in Thy name, and in obedience to Thy most blessed will, we now by the laying on of our hands (here the Moderator and other Presbyters lay their hands on the head of the Candidate) admit to a wider exercise of the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments.

We entreat Thee to grant unto Thy servant, to whom this sacred trust is now committed, such fulness of grace as shall fit him more and more for the work to which he has been called. Give him utterance, that he may boldly make known Thy word and will, and faithfully dispense

the mysteries of the Gospel. Endue him with wisdom and zeal to rule aright the people over whom Thou hast set him, and to preserve them in peace and purity, so that Thy Church, under his administration and example, may increase in grace and holiness. Strengthen him by Thy Spirit, that he may abide steadfast to the end, and be received, with all Thy faithful servants, into the joy of his Lord.

O God, give grace, we beseech Thee, to Thy people to whom Thy servant is to minister in holy things, that they may be enlightened by divine truth, edified by the ministry of the Word, quickened by the Spirit of Life, established in all holy living, guided into manifold Christian labours, and used for the furtherance of the Saviour's kingdom. May both minister and people be kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation.

Our Father which art in heaven, etc.

Now unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto Him be glory in the Church by Jesus Christ throughout all ages world without end. *Amen.*

Prayer being ended, the Minister shall rise, and the Moderator, addressing him, shall say:—

In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, the only King and Head of the Church, and by authority of this Presbytery, I invite you to take part with us in this ministry, and admit you to all the rights and privileges thereto pertaining.

Then the members of the Presbytery shall give him the right hand of fellowship, the Moderator saying:—

We give you the right hand of fellowship to take part with us in this ministry.

The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you. *Amen.*

2. Anglican Form of Commission to Presbyterians

Statement:

The Candidates having been presented to the Bishop then shall the Bishop say:—

Forasmuch as terms have been arranged between the Church of England in Canada and the Presbyterian Church in Canada, with the purpose of realizing, through a visible and corporate union, their common fellowship in the Universal Church of Christ, and of manifesting that fellowship to the world, and forasmuch as it is necessary that there should be in this united Church a ministry that shall be acknowledged in every part thereof, it is our purpose now to give to these our brethren, by the laying on of our hands, a commission to the office of priesthood, it being clearly understood that herein there is no repudiation of or reflection on their past ministry, to which they were set apart by the Holy Spirit, whose call led them to that ministry and whose power enabled them to perform the same.

Invocation: Then shall be said or sung, "Come Holy Ghost," etc.

Prayer: Then shall the Bishop say:—

Almighty God and heavenly Father, who of Thine infinite love and goodness towards us hast given to us Thy only and most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ, to be our Redeemer and the Author of everlasting life; who, after He had made perfect our redemption by His death, and was ascended into heaven, sent abroad into the world his Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Doctors, and Pastors, by whose labour and ministry he gathered together a great flock in all the parts of the world, to set forth the eternal praise of Thy holy Name: For these so great benefits of Thy eternal goodness, and for that Thou hast vouchsafed to call these Thy servants here present to the same office and ministry, appointed for the salvation of

mankind, to be exercised in the wider sphere of the united Church; we render unto Thee most hearty thanks, we praise and worship Thee, and we humbly beseech Thee, by the same Thy blessed Son to grant unto all, which either here or elsewhere call upon Thy holy Name, that we may continue to show ourselves thankful unto Thee for these and all other Thy benefits; and that we may daily increase and go forward in the knowledge and faith of Thee and Thy Son, by the Holy Spirit. So that as well by these Thy Ministers, as by them over whom they shall be appointed Thy Ministers, Thy holy Name may be forever glorified, and Thy blessed Kingdom enlarged, through the same Thy Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with Thee in the unity of the same Holy Spirit, world without end. *Amen.*

Commission: Then the Candidates shall kneel, and the Bishop with the priests present, shall lay hands severally on the head of every one, the Bishop saying:—

*Take thou authority to execute this office now committed to thee by the imposition of our hands. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of His Holy Sacraments. In the Name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. *Amen.*

II

The Joint Report of the conference ends as above. The committee of Presbytery submits it as a basis of mutual understanding for the consideration of the Presbytery, and it makes the following addenda in its own name.

(*a*) The following is the statement or declaration which the Presbytery's committee had prepared to take the place of the first paragraph (p. 3 of Report) in "1. Presbyterian Form of Commission to Anglicans"; but

*Adapted from alternative formula in Ordinal of Protestant Episcopal Church, U. S. A.

it was read to the conference at too late a moment to be considered and included in the Report. It is identical with the statement in "2. Anglican Form of Commission to Presbyterians" (pp. 5 and 6 of Report), with the exception of a phrase, printed in italics in the copy below, substituted for the corresponding phrase in the Anglican form, as being the phrase used in the "Book of Common Order of the Presbyterian Church."

1. Presbyterian Form of Commission to Anglicans

Statement:

The Candidates having presented themselves before the Moderator of Presbytery, the Moderator shall say:—

Forasmuch as terms have been arranged between the Presbyterian Church in Canada and the Church of England in Canada, with the purpose of realizing, through a visible and corporate union, their common fellowship in the Universal Church of Christ, and of manifesting that fellowship to the world, and forasmuch as it is necessary that there should be in this united Church a ministry that shall be acknowledged in every part thereof, it is our purpose now to give to these our brethren, by the laying on of our hands, a commission *to take part with us in this ministry,* it being clearly understood that herein there is no repudiation of or reflection on their past ministry, to which they were set apart by the Holy Spirit, whose call led them to that ministry and whose power enabled them to perform the same.

(*b*) It was agreed by common consent without definite resolution that in the reciprocal commission each communion would accept the form or order in present use in the other communion, with alterations in the terms of the formula required by the existing ministerial status of those concerned. This explains the difference in the forms of commission. The "priesthood" named in the

Anglican commission stands for a specific grade of ministry in the Church.

(*c*) It will be observed in the scheme that re-ordination of Ministers is not involved.

(*d*) It was stated by responsible spokesmen of both committees that uniformity of worship would not be required, although no specific resolution to that effect was passed or considered by the conference.

R. E. WELSH,
Convener of the Committee of the Presbytery of Montreal.

THE CHURCH

THE temples of the flesh are reared, and fall;
Our sanctuaries crumble stone by stone.
And yet, in life triumphant over all,
Through age on age increasing, thou alone,
Intangible, and so from worm and time
Immune, dost bear to us the Theme Sublime.

What if men tear thy robes of faith apart
(By such rare portions blinded to the whole
Still past conception of the mortal heart),
And with but partial truth would warm the soul?
Thou art the Christ's, and even hosts of hell
Thy final sovereignty may not quell.

Heaven's beloved! Reign Queen, Messiah's Bride,
Bought with His pain, anointed by His blood.
Arise! To all His children open wide
Thy portals—like the arms of motherhood;
Redeem within thyself His love-sealed vow:
The fainting world awaits its revelation now!

—*Edna Marie Le Nart.*

THE CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN REUNION HAVING REFERENCE TO DR. ARTHUR C. HEADLAM'S BAMPTON LECTURES FOR 1920 ON "THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN REUNION"*

I ESTEEM it a great privilege to perform the part which you have assigned to me in this discussion of Dr. Headlam's Bampton Lectures in relation to the problem of Christian reunion. Time limits forbid me to review these Lectures in their details except so far as they bear in a determinative way on his main argument, conclusion and recommendation. Even so I may have to employ abrupt and blunt expressions. I trust you will not interpret them as indicating an unsympathetic dogmatism.

Inasmuch as the nature of Dr. Headlam's thesis compels me to give what may seem to be a disproportionate emphasis to the episcopate, I wish to say at this point that, while in agreement with over two-thirds of Christendom to-day, I deem the episcopate to be a divinely provided, and therefore unalterable, means for overseeing and safeguarding the Church's administration of its God-given system of truth and grace. It is as a means rather than as an end that I regard it. None the less, in view of the function which I believe it has received from Christ and His Apostles, I am forced to give its general acceptance a necessary place among the conditions of visible unity. The vast and ancient consensus which supports this view forbids that my standpoint should be regarded as individualistic, partisan or provincial. If I seem individualistic in my method of argument, I claim no exemption from criticism on that score.

*Read at a recent meeting of the Christian Unity Foundation, New York.

I. Dr. Headlam's Lectures

Dr. Headlam's Lectures demand attention both on account of their source and because of their giving a fresh turn to unity discussions. But they uncover no new data, and are not likely to have more than a passing vogue. They contain many good things that need attention; but their main thread of argument, that upon which the lecturer bases his final conclusion and recommendation, is vitiated by mistaken methods, by misinterpretations of the positions which he rejects, and by failure to reckon sufficiently with certain determinative facts and testimonies. He makes many disputatious assertions and generalizations, and *non sequitur* is the true comment on several inferences that determine his general argument. His tone is dignified and, except towards sacerdotalists, kindly. The calm confidence and rapidity with which he solves many troublesome historical problems is magisterial and sublime.

At the obvious risk of being accused of the same type of assurance in speaking so summarily—there lie, of course, many years of study of the lecturer's subject behind my words—I feel constrained to confine my attention to the line which I have already indicated. I am concerned with the validity of his conclusion that no specific and unalterable form of the Church's ministry has been prescribed by Christ or His Apostles, but that the ministerial commission was given to the Church collectively; so that it has authority to determine the methods and agencies of ordination, provided the laying on of hands with prayer and visible intention of doing what the Church means to do in ordaining ministers of Christ are retained. On this basis he urges that episcopal and non-episcopal communions should recognize each other's ministries; but that, for practical success in recovering and preserving visible unity, all future ordinations should be conformed to the traditional episcopal method.

The method by which the lecturer's conclusion is reached is open to grave criticism. He provides an elaborate argument for a foregone conclusion, but describes it as an attempt to pursue the historical method with as little bias as human nature will permit. If a scholar has reached conclusions in his study which he believes to be practically important for others, he is entitled to publish an argumentative treatise in their behalf. But if he visibly fails to realize and acknowledge the polemical nature of his production, this failure will necessarily reduce the thoughtful reader's estimate of its scholarly value.

The lecturer accentuates his mistake by contrasting his method with that which he ascribes to Bishop Gore in his great work, *The Church and the Ministry,* and to Dr. Moberly in his *Ministerial Priesthood.* Both of these works contain argumentative matter, but have a generally accepted scholarly form and method. That is, they clearly set forth the theory which their authors employ as their working hypothesis, and proceed to verify it by reckoning with the known relevant facts. They are evidently at home with the historical method, and endeavor to do justice to the relevant facts. If any details of their interpretation of them are open to dispute, their method of procedure is not. It is scholarly.

In substance their working hypothesis is that the broad stream of tradition concerning the apostolic origin, and the appointed form and method of perpetuation of the Christian ministry which possessed the field in the earliest post-apostolic period of which we have adequate knowledge is to be accepted until we obtain sufficient contrary evidence. On this basis Bishop Gore proceeds to discuss comprehensively the relevant facts of the New Testament and sub-apostolic period, and concludes that they agree with the working hypothesis previously adopted, and apparently with no other.

Dr. Headlam stigmatizes this hypothesis as indicating

polemical bias, and goes to the length of ignoring the tradition referred to, even as one of the facts to be reckoned with. He insists that the documentary material of the apostolic period afford the sole data for argument, and that we may not assume the apostolic origin and prescription of any arrangements which are not indisputably set forth in these documents. He acknowledges more than once that the data to which he thus shuts himself are fragmentary and insufficient for assured conclusions, and then refuses to take just account of the impression which apostolic action and teaching produced on the general mind of the Church which emerges half a century later. This is the more striking because no trace appears of any revolution during the intervening period that would have tended to interrupt and subvert the Church's memory of apostolic appointments. Furthermore, the testimonies of St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch, who had first-hand personal acquaintance with apostolic arrangements, directly confirm determinative elements of the Church's tradition concerning them. St. Clement declares that provision for continuance of oversight in the Churches was made by the Apostles in obedience to forewarnings of Christ, Himself; and St. Ignatius asserts a necessity for ecclesiastical organization of the ministry of bishops, presbyters and deacons which plainly implies divine or apostolic prescription.

To put this in another way, the state of the question in the second century as to whether the Apostles made permanent prescriptions concerning the form and method of perpetuation of the Church's ministry, and as to the fundamental nature of these prescriptions, agrees with that which held its own in the whole Church until the Protestant revolt, and which still prevails in over two-thirds of Christendom. Dating so far back as it does—to a generation which could still consult those who had

listened to apostolic teaching—and having the chronic vitality which for many centuries it has exhibited in a Church to which the Lord pledged the permanent guidance of His Holy Spirit, it plainly throws the burden of proof on the shoulders of those who would go behind the returns and reject the conclusions thus impressively handed down.

In accepting this solidly supported state of the question as his working hypothesis in investigating the fragmentary data of early documents, Bishop Gore proceeded in accordance with a generally accepted scientific method. In ignoring it, and in basing his contrary thesis upon what he explicitly acknowledges to be inadequate data, open in details to mutually conflicting interpretations, Dr. Headlam violates the scientific method; and he conspicuously fails to shoulder the burden of proof, either in form of procedure or in sufficiency of disproof of the previously dominant teaching of the ancient Catholic Church. I feel justified, therefore, in maintaining that the validity of his main conclusions is discredited by the fundamental mistake of his method.

And his method is not soundly historical. He ignores, or fails to acknowledge the significance of certain troublesome facts. Throughout his volume he is obviously concerned to establish a thesis rather than to let all the relevant facts—in particular the ancient stream of tradition of which I have spoken—speak for themselves. His motive—that of facilitating a solution of the problem of Christian reunion—is, of course, worthy of praise; but this motive does not justify his frequent special pleading. It may not warrant forgetting that reunion based upon rejection of the ancient mind of the universal Church as to what is integral to its divinely constituted order involves violation of an ancient sense of stewardship, and cannot secure general consent.

To transfer the basis of acceptance of the episcopate

from that of Spirit-guided apostolic ordinance to that of twentieth-century unity-compact is to open up the possibility of subversion of the ancient ministry, if the future drift of opinion concerning its pragmatic value should point that way. Stewardship cannot compromise with pragmatism, except at the risk of forfeiture. Of course, if modern scholars successfully shoulder the burden of proof and clearly establish the mistaken nature of the sense of stewardship referred to, the state of the question will be altered. Furthermore, the importance of Christian reunion imposes upon us the duty of patiently weighing their evidence. But those who are convinced of the truth of the traditional doctrine in this matter ought not to be expected, even for unity's sake, to assent to arrangements inconsistent therewith, until their convictions are modified by convincing evidence. It is just possible that the agreement on this thorny subject for which we all earnestly long will come through modification of modern rather than of traditional convictions.

II. The Apostolic Ministry

I shall perhaps most effectively meet certain important errors of our Bampton lecturer in his treatment of historical data, by presenting a differently constructed rapid survey of the data that bear on the truth of the traditional view of the ministry.

(a) I start, as I believe sound methods of argument require me to start, with the outstanding fact that, when the mind of the Church as to the appointments of Christ and of His Spirit-guided Apostles first registered itself in ways that unmistakably reveal to us its determinative content—a content which underwent no essential change in subsequent centuries—the so-called Catholic view was in full possession, with no appearance of its being new. I assume that the freshness of the concurrent traditions which explain this view justifies provisional acceptance

of its credibility, at least until sufficient contrary evidence of earlier date is forthcoming. I reject the contention that its prevalence can have no determinative value unless clear and self-sufficient demonstration of its validity can be obtained from earlier documentary data. I reject it because, many competent scholars being witness, these earlier data are not sufficient, that is, when considered in isolation from the main stream of tradition, to afford demonstration in either direction. I ought to add, however, that they tend to confirm rather than to overthrow the general tradition.

This traditional view included the following determinative particulars:

(1) The Apostles under divine guidance, whether of specific directions from Christ or not, established the form and method of perpetuation of the permanent ministry of the Church. This element of the tradition is explicitly confirmed by St. Clement's testimony, given as early as 95 or 96 A.D.

(2) As a consequence, no other ministry was acknowledged to be consistent with a full and valid organization and functioning of a Christian Church except that of bishops, priests and deacons. This is clearly set forth by St. Ignatius of Antioch about 110 A.D., a man who, like St. Clement, enjoyed first-hand acquaintance with apostolic teaching.

(3) Bishops in the finally crystallized meaning of that designation were considered to be the only agents competent to perform valid ordinations to this ministry; and no undeniable evidence exists that either in the apostolic or in the sub-apostolic period any ordination was accepted as valid which was not performed either by the Apostles or by the higher Order of "apostolic men" of which the historic episcopate was and ever has been the continuation. Dr. Headlam himself is compelled to acknowledge that the cases alleged as exceptions "are doubtful. Either

the evidence is inconclusive or the readings vary." The local custom of "confessors" exercising the presbyterate without ordination is non-relevant, and as confessedly an abnormality soon passed away. And these confessors never ventured to ordain ministers. The precise nature of the peculiar early method of appointing the bishop of Alexandria is open to dispute, but the supposition that mere presbyters consecrated him is not a necessary inference from the testimony, nor is it supported by any proof; and whatever the peculiar custom was, it gave way in the third century to the methods elsewhere prevailing.

Dr. Headlam's discovery that the phrase "apostolic succession" did not mean in patristic use a succession by ordination, but of oversight in particular Sees and of ministerial functions, is not so modern as he appears to think, and for his purposes is what is popularly called a "mare's nest." The question is not of conformity of patristic phrase to modern usage but of the antiquity of the principle that no one can validly receive the apostolic power of ordaining ministers for Christ's Catholic Church except by devolution from above. The ancient requirement of episcopal ordination, coupled with belief that such requirement was of apostolic origin, is obviously equivalent to acceptance of the principle of uninterrupted devolution. As no serious controversy on the point arose until the Protestants of the sixteenth century were constrained to defend their innovating practice, we naturally find no ancient discussions of the subject. But what we mean by the phrase "apostolic succession," or uninterrupted devolution of the ministerial commission from above, was in full possession and carefully adhered to on the basis of apostolic tradition.

(b) The above indicated broad stream of tradition which is found to prevail in the Church from the earliest

post-apostolic period of which we have assured knowledge, coupled with the earnest care then notoriously emphasized in preserving and adhering to apostolic tradition, determines the state of the question and appears to dictate substantially the following line of enquiry. Does our available knowledge of the apostolic age, and of the brief sub-apostolic period previous to the clear emergence of the general stream of tradition referred to, enable us to determine the trustworthiness of this tradition in the fundamental particulars of doctrine and practice pertaining to the ministry?

The broad circumstance has to be faced that no formal exposition of the subject such as would afford self-sufficient demonstration as to the particulars of the tradition under consideration, is to be found in first-century documents. The same lack of determinative apostolic exposition besets the argument for other vital things. The question of the sacred canon itself affords an example. We are forced, therefore, to depend upon certain New Testament passages of limited scope, and upon the circumstantial evidence which a very incomplete history of the apostolic Church affords. My contention here is that in spite of these limitations, the available data of the apostolic age tend to confirm the hypothesis that the later Catholic tradition of which I am speaking is substantially correct. Certainly not one indisputable circumstance or utterance of apostolic significance precludes such a conclusion.

(1) The Lord probably did give His ministerial commission to a larger ecclesiastical assembly than "the twelve," but He gave it to the Church *as Church,* that is, as the organism, of which He had made the twelve to be the original official organs. Dr. Headlam accepts the organic conception of the Church, which is strongly emphasized by St. Paul, but overlooks the implication that the divinely appointed corporate functions of the Church

have to be exercised organically; and the same Apostle clearly teaches that the structural nature and ministry of this organism is not determined by the collective will of Christians but by its divine Creator. God has set in the Church its ministers, and they represent the agency by which alone the Creator of the Body of Christ determines its organic functioning. The Church, therefore, can no more change the form of its ministry than a human body can change the form of its organs. The Creator of the organism has determined this forever.

(2) For the creative work of establishing the Church its apostolic ministry was supplemented by an extraordinary and, as the event proved, temporary ministry of men with charismatic gifts. But the permanent pastorate of the Churches apparently fell into the hands of those whom the Apostles ordained to that end. The charismatic ministry was largely itinerant and bore marks of being supplementary. We have to look to local arrangements for evidence of Apostolic appointments and of the permanent form which the Christian ministry was designed to take. The process of local organization was gradual. Most of "the Churches" had presbyters and deacons ordained for them by men empowered to ordain by the Apostles. Timothy and Titus are examples. The local presbyters during this period were also called bishops as having the local oversight. It was apparently not deemed safe at the missionary stage to equip the local Churches with a self-perpetuating ministry. But the Mother Church of Jerusalem was completely organized. Dr. Headlam acknowledges that its organization "suggests an exact resemblance to that in later days of bishop, presbyter, and deacon"; adding that "it is not improbable that that model assisted in the building up of the later organization of the Church." None the less he strangely describes it as "abnormal." A more reasonable view is that the subsequent rule of the Church in employing this

constitution as the prescriptive norm for the organization of local Churches when they were ready for full equipment, was in accord with the known mind of the Apostles. This view is confirmed by the fairly well established fact that the Apostle St. John, to whom fell the task of completing the organization of the Churches in Asia, organized them in strict accord with the Jerusalem pattern. And his disciple, St. Ignatius, declared that bishops, presbyters, and deacons are necessary for a fully organized Church.

These facts of the apostolic age appear to me strongly to confirm the subsequent Catholic tradition; and no facts are known which offset them. The details of completion of local Church organization during the intervening half century or more of obscurity are largely beyond our reach. But no trace of any revolution appears. And no evidence of the use or acceptance of presbyterial or congregational ordination can be found. In brief, the genetic facts of the apostolic period, coupled with the apostolic doctrine that the Church's ministry is of divine ordering, fit in perfectly with the subsequent working system of the Church and with the then general belief in the apostolic origin of that system.

My conclusion is that the ancient state of the question concerning the apostolic origin and prescription of the form and the method of perpetuating the Church's ministry is susceptible of as complete verification as the available data permit, and of sufficient verification abundantly to justify the sense of responsibility still felt in over two-thirds of Christendom for refusing to compromise the Catholic doctrine and practice as to the ministry and the method of ordination. Those who are persuaded that the Catholic ministry is a sacred trust from above cannot righteously agree to shift its basis of preservation to that of human compacts, subject to revision as such compacts necessarily are.

Unless my argument is fundamentally astray, the fatal obstacle to Dr. Headlam's proposal of mutual recognition of ministries and of compact hereafter to employ episcopal ordination everywhere is very clear. It would violate the consciences of a vast majority of those who would have to accept it. Its plausibility lies wholly in the provincial atmosphere of its origin. Considered in ecumenical light, it is a hopelessly futile scheme.

III. Conditions of Unity

I realize fully that my conclusion will seem to Protestants to be equivalent to an obstinate *non possumus* in the matter of reunion between Protestant and Catholic believers. It really means that the road to visible unity between these sections of Christendom lies through change of existing convictions concerning this and certain other matters, also deemed to be insusceptible of righteous compromise. If such change of convictions as will bring these sections into accord in fundamental regards is impossible, the visible unity for which we are laboring is impossible. But the plain call of God to unity teaches me that it is not impossible, but that our studies and conferences will in due course develop a larger atmosphere and create a standpoint from which, by the Spirit's guidance, we shall be able to think the same things fundamentally speaking, and use common terms—terms which, unlike current *ad interim* eirenicons, will not be interpreted by their signers in mutually discordant senses.

At present it is clearly futile to push for the adoption of any schematic procedure for union, whether complete or partial, between episcopal and non-episcopal communions. They are nobly meant, of course, but hopelessly premature. The old malicious aloofness is giving way, thanks to God's merciful grace, to a growing mutual kindliness and sympathy. A course of mutual educa-

tion, the long continuance of which is essential to real mutual understanding and growth into fundamental accord, is now getting under way. It has only begun. Why should forcing schemes be intruded at this delicate stage? Mutual interchanges of pulpits must alarm many Episcopalians and prejudice them against the whole movement; and the same result, along with a weakening of our normal internal discipline, must attend the advocated practice of admitting to our communicant privileges those who not only have not been confirmed, but who reject that "foundation," as the Epistle to the Hebrews describes it. The advocated scheme of giving episcopal ordination to nonconformist ministers, while leaving them free to retain the nonconformist status, appears to many of our clergy and laity to be obviously and hopelessly inconsistent with what they are convinced is integral to a God-given stewardship.

These are conditions to be reckoned with, and to overrule them is to retard instead of helping on the cause we have at heart. Let us then adhere carefully to the line of least resistance. Let us face our differences in loving conference, while recognizing that hasty action, likely to upset concord, must wait for the completion of our mutual education.

What ought to be the result of such education? I cannot express it more successfully than in the words of the Declaration on Unity published by our bishops in 1886. It will lead us to perceive that Christian unity "can be restored only by the return of all Christian communions to the principles of unity exemplified by the undivided Catholic Church during the first ages of its existence, which principles we believe to be the substantial deposit of Christian Faith and Order committed by Christ and His Apostles to the Church unto the end of the world, and therefore incapable of compromise or surrender by those who have been ordained to be its stewards

and trustees for the common and equal benefit of all men." The four articles appended to this Declaration, called "The Quadrilateral," were not given as a comprehensive list of terms of unity, but "inherent parts of this sacred deposit," which might well be considered at the outset in conferences concerning the conditions of unity.

The Lambeth Conference of 1888 republished the Quadrilateral with the same limited intent—as "a basis on which approach may be by God's blessing made towards Home Reunion." Each article thus set forth in skeleton form really stands for a field of inquiry in which many subjects require discussion; and much growth towards a common mind is indispensable, if we are to achieve a visible unity which shall not be followed by subsequent disillusionment and renewed discord. The Lambeth Conference of 1920, as the eminent Congregational divine, Dr. A. E. Garvie, perceives, has not reversed our attitude in principle. He says (*The Constructive Quarterly,* Dec., 1920, P. 563) of the Anglican bishops, "They have felt as Christians, and every Christian heartily responds; but they have thought as Catholics, and there their Appeal challenges doubt and question." He is right; and if the bishops hinted at possible procedures, pending the restoration of unity, which if actualized at this stage would seriously disturb many Anglicans, they were obviously straining at limitations which they could not conscientiously repudiate in order to demonstrate the strength of their craving for unity with their separated brethren.

Let us re-gather ourselves. What in other terms does the Anglican Appeal, as defined in these documents, come to? I think that Dr. Palmer, Bishop of Bombay, expresses it with some success, in *The Constructive Quarterly* for March, 1921, and with more elaborate discussion in his little book, *The Great Church Awakes.* His thought in a nutshell is that the unity to which we are being called

is that of the great universal Church of Christ, and that the problems of unity cannot be successfully considered and solved except from the standpoint of that Church. When this standpoint is reached by us all, new and larger light will come to us all, and thorny problems will somehow lose their thorniness and simply fade away. It is in that direction that I am convinced our education and mutual approximation lies. And the consummation is possible, for "God wills it." But for some time our work should consist of study, conference and prayer—not schematic procedures.

I believe we shall all come to see that what we need is not to save our denominational faces but to save the face of God's great universal Church. It is not to build a Church of the future out of denominational material, but to discover the great Church already existing, and to be absorbed with every really good thing we have in the abounding life and light thereof. It is not to frame a concordat of faith and order, but to return all of us to the fulness of the great Church's faith and order. It is not to denominationalize principles, which means to isolate them from their balancing context to caricature them, and to bring them into odium in the rest of Christendom, but it is to end denominationalism entirely, in favor of the stronger and more enlightened stewardship of the whole Church of God. We have need to see that in that Church alone can the brethren unite their resources for the effectual guarding of things needing to be guarded, whether in the direction of the common faith, order and discipline or in that of true freedom. When we see this, we shall see much that we now fail to understand; and the awakening of the great Church will be our own awakening to the pettinesses of denominational stipulations and adjustments. These can never be more than "flickering expedients" to reduce or conceal the consequences of disunion without curing it. We really need the

extinction of denominations and of their divisive standpoints. Denominational Churches are the forms of disunity, and their continuance is the continuance of a broken and spiritually impoverished Christendom.

FRANCIS J. HALL.

General Theological Seminary,
New York.

THE GOLDEN AGE

THE golden age will dawn
When man shall dare to be
From false ambition free,
His goal the truth;
When every youth
Shall seek, not wealth and fame,
But this,—a spotless name.
Righteousness shall be bold
In that fair age of gold.

The golden age will come
When men shall work for joy;
When each shall find employ
Suited to each;
When toil shall teach,
Not bring the soul disgust;
Men will not hear, "Thou must!"
Labor will not be sold,
In that bright age of gold.

The golden age on earth
Will be a time of peace;
The wars of greed shall cease;
Envy shall fail,
Mercy prevail;
Creeds shall not separate;
Caste shall be out of date;
Love shall all hearts enfold
In that fair age of gold.

—*Thomas Curtis Clark.*

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

In the Dallas Christian Unity Conference, Dallas, Texas, held under the auspices of the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, Bishop G. H. Kinsolving, of Texas, speaking on the Lambeth Conference of which he was a member, said,

Among the many arguments advanced in the Lambeth conference in behalf of the need of unity which impressed me very much was the one which came from the Bishop-Chaplains who had served in the late war, and had witnessed the disadvantages under which the Church had tried to do her work. Prominent in this number was our own Bishop Brent, the ranking chaplain in the American Expeditionary Force. It set one thinking along the lines of how hate and fear seem to be chief unifying principles in human affairs, and love seems to be so comparatively weak. Here was a great war waged, and at once all the nations with a common hate united as one body to destroy several other nations who were bound together by the same kind of low and earthborn passion. And so it has always been in the history of the nations. Bishop Temple in a recent article on Church unity has pointed out how in ancient times the Greeks were one in their wars with the oriental powers. The Romans were one while Cato cried daily in the forum "*Delenda est Carthago.*" And when we skip across the centuries we find the same phenomenon in Europe in our day. We know how united Mahommedanism is, which is a religion of hate, and uses the sword as the principal instrument for its propagation. Yet Christianity, which claims to be a religion of love, found itself unable to function, save in a very limited degree, in allaying the passions of hate which inspired men at war, or in ministering to the suffering and needs of those who were engaged in this awful struggle. The great Protestant Churches had their hands tied by reason of their unhappy divisions, and we were subjected to the humiliating substitute of doing our work through semi-secular organizations like the Red Cross Society and the Young Men's Christian Association. Even a Jesuit priest, Father Leslie J. Walker, who was a chaplain, realized the sadness of such a spectacle, and the grievous loss of spiritual influence Christianity suffered because of the diversity of its champions. And he has written a very suggestive book on "The Problem of Reunion" in which he pleads for a union of Christian bodies among Protestants, and while the book is full of Rome's peculiarities and claims, it seems to be the product of a mind inspired by a sincere desire to improve and strengthen the cause of our common religion.

After the adjournment of our conference I visited some of the battle fields of France, and again this subject of reunion which we had discussed so earnestly was forced home upon my mind. I stood gazing over some of the cemeteries where our dear boys were lying at peace and rest, and would that I could express to you what a tumult of emotions rushed in upon my heart as I looked upon the long rows of white crosses, which stood as headstones over each of the graves. "Ah, Lord God!" I asked myself, "did our boys have to die before they could be united and have their graves marked by the same emblem of a common faith!" How sick and weary it makes one feel as we think of this subject of Christian

disunion and discord when brought face to face with suggestions which come into the mind from considerations like these! Is our religion, indeed, a religion of love, or, on the contrary, can it be true of us, as Dean Swift in biting satire said of the Church in his day "We have learned enough religion to make us hate each other but not enough to love?" Is the sneering mockery of Herbert Spencer descriptive of us when he says "It would clear up our ideas about many things if we distinctly recognized the truth that we have two religions, the religion of amity and the religion of enmity. Of course I do not mean that they are both called religions. I am speaking, not of names, I am speaking simply of things. Nowadays men do not pay the same nominal homage to the religion of enmity that they do to the religion of amity: the religion of amity occupies the place of honor, but the real homage is paid in large measure, if not larger measure, to the religion of enmity. The religion of enmity nearly all men actually believe; the religion of amity most of them merely believe that they believe."

The English poet, Shelley, once sighed to his friend—"What a divine religion might be found out if Charity were made the principle of it instead of Faith!" And this he said, though it is written in the Book of books "The greatest of these is charity." And "A new commandment give I unto you that ye love one another." President Lincoln is reported to have made the remark to a visitor at the White House, "I have never united myself to any Church, but when any Church will inscribe over its altar as its sole qualification for membership the Saviour's condensed statement of the substance of both the law and the gospel, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself' that Church will I join with all my heart and soul."

Are these taunts and criticisms justly taken? Is the Church so fundamentally lacking in practice that we have deservedly become the objects of ridicule and contumely to those outside the forms of organized Christianity? I am asking myself in all seriousness that question, and our branch of the Church is asking such questions, and that is another of the many reason why we are making our overtures to the Christian world. Speaking for myself may I not be permitted to express my own personal conviction that this great movement which is stirring in the hearts of thousands of the most thoughtful and earnest among Christ's people, will continue to grow, and finally formulate itself into some system whereby we can all come together in substantial agreement and do our work in harmony and love, as becometh true and loyal followers and disciples of the great Head of the Church. I am very hopeful for the ultimate outcome. I am convinced that it is God's cause and He will open the way for its triumph. I have put myself into the work because I believe in it. I am not talking merely for the sake of making a speech, my heart is in the work. Let us not dispose of the subject now by simply passing some pious resolutions, or to use a slang expression, if you will pardon it "passing the buck" on to other meetings and organizations. Let us get down to heart-searching consideration of the subject and see it through.

The day is breaking upon God's church and we are most sanguine and enthusiastic in our belief that we are on the right road to win the approval and blessing of our one divine Lord and Master, whom we all love and in various ways are trying to serve. I am willing now to answer any questions and offer explanations of any points in the Appeal which anyone present may wish to be made clear.

Dr. Graham Frank, of the Central Christian Church of Dallas, asked if he should come to Episcopal authorities and receive orders, and be ordained by a bishop, would he then be free to remain in charge of

the Central Christian Church and be permitted to preach in an Episcopal Church, to which question the Bishop replied, that he would be free in both particulars. The movement is intended for fellowship, not for absorption nor uniformity. The Bishop referred to the case of the Archbishop of York, who hoped by some such arrangement that he, the Archbishop, might be welcomed authoritatively into his father's pulpit. His father is a distinguished Presbyterian minister, while the Presbyterian father with an Episcopal ordination might be welcomed into the pulpit of York Minster.

Rev. William E. Gilroy writing in *The Christian Century*, Chicago, regarding Church union in Canada, says,

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, meeting in Toronto, in June, voted by an overwhelming majority, 414 for, and 107 against— about four to one—to proceed with the necessary steps for the consummation of union with the Methodist Church of Canada, and the Congregational Churches of Canada. As this action of the Presbyterians was taken upon a definitely proposed basis of union, already almost unanimously approved by the Methodists and Congregationalists, who had taken official action, and were waiting only for the Presbyterians to come to a decision, it would appear that these three bodies have now entered upon the closing stages of the most remarkable Church union movement in modern times.

The movement has been remarkable for its extent, covering, territorially, the entire dominion, and the interests of the three bodies in foreign lands; involving the two largest Protestant denominations in the country, and representing, all told, much more than one-half of the Protestant population, and almost one-third of the total population, of Canada. It has been remarkable for the persistence with which, in a period of almost twenty years, it has gone on, in spite of some elements of determined opposition, and in spite of the inevitable delays, which often prove more disastrous to such movements than actual opposition. But more remarkable is the fact that the movement has been from the beginning a definite movement for organic union, largely taking for granted sentimental and academic considerations regarding church union in general, and resisting strongly every effort toward compromise on the basis of federation, or cooperation. And this fact is itself the more remarkable when the elements seeking such organic union are taken into account—two great bodies, historically divided, not only by temper and tradition, but by the bitter cleavage between Calvinism and Arminianism, not only seeking organic union with each other, but putting polity as well as dogma into the melting-pot in their effort to take into the union a group of churches, small, but vigorous, and almost ferociously independent. So far as I am aware, it is the first effort upon a wide scale to bring into organic union these opposite poles of Calvinism and Arminianism, connexionalism and congregationalism.

WHY ALL ARE NOT IN

The question will naturally be asked, Why has a movement so broad, and so diverse, not taken in all the Protestant elements in Canada? The fact is that as far back as 1906, when the nature of the movement was already fairly well defined, official action was taken explaining what had been done thus far, and inviting both the Baptists and the Church of England to participate in further discussions, should they

deem it advisable to do so. The Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec replied to this overture by setting forth their distinctive principles, and stating that because of these principles they considered it "necessary to maintain a separate organized existence," and "to propagate their views throughout the world." The Episcopalians received the proposals cordially. There are undoubtedly many in that communion who have earnestly desired to see their church a party to the negotiations, on much the same basis as the other bodies, but the prevailing opinion has been favorable toward parleyings, approaches and academic discussions, such as we are familiar with in all negotiations with Episcopalians on this side of the line. The Presbyterians, Methodists and Congregationalists have been unwilling to halt their movement, or to sacrifice its immediacy and its definitely practical character for the sake of some less certain, and far distant, if broader, results. There has been question, also, as to whether the result would prove broader, or whether the inclusion of the Episcopalians in the negotiations would not introduce new necessities for compromise. My impression is that the invitation to the Church of England in Canada was suggested rather as a concession to the general sentiment regarding Church union, than as an act of hope. In any case, the movement nears consummation, as it began—a movement involving only the three fellowships, Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational. There is room for wide latitude of interpretation as to what may constitute the steps necessary for the consummation of the union. My own opinion is that it will be some years yet, at least five, and possibly ten, before the final consummation takes place.

Dr. William Adams Brown in *The Constructive Quarterly,* New York, says,

The relation of federal union to organic union is not so easy to define, since there is a sense in which they overlap and many even coalesce. In theory federal union may be either (*a*) a step toward organic union, or even (*b*) a form which organic union may take. But as usually understood it represents a form of Christian union which, while affecting the denomination as a whole, stops short of organic union. There are those who would go farther and regard it as a substitute for organic union.

What is characteristic of federal union as distinct from other forms of corporate union is that it retains the individuality of the uniting Churches unimpaired. Even if they delegate their powers to another agency, they are able to resume them at any time. But organic union carries with it a note of irrevocableness such as exists in the relation of the several states in the American union to the central government.

The analogy of the states of the union is a helpful one, because it shows not only the difference between federal union and organic union, but also their points of contact and transition. The theory of the Southern states before 1861 was the theory of federal union in the narrower sense. They had surrendered powers but for the time only. What they had given they believed they could resume. But to the North this alternative no longer existed. Federal union to them meant organic union; not because they denied the right of the separate states to existence and sovereignty within the sphere of rights reserved, but because they believed that the rights surrendered when the union was constituted were surrendered irrevocably.

In distinguishing organic union from federal union, therefore, this is the point on which we must insist. Organic union is not a matter of

degree, but of kind. It is union which, however far it extends, is in its nature irrevocable, or at least is believed to be so by those who enter into it.

* * * *

What is essential in the matter of organic union, is not so much the form of organization as the attitude of mind involved. Underlying all differences of attitude toward the practical questions involved are deep-seated differences as to the conception of the Church itself. What do we mean by the Church of Christ? What it its nature and authority? Above all, what is the relation between that oneness in spirit and experience which we have agreed to call unity and the outward forms of organization to which we have reserved the term union? Are these separable or do they necessarily go together? Which is dependent upon the other? How far may spiritual unity co-exist with differences of external organization? According to the way in which one answers these questions will be his attitude to the question of organic union.

Rev. L. W. McCreary in *The Christian Century,* Chicago says,

Christian leaders of today are almost unanimously agreed that the immediate outlook for the church is alarming. It was thought that the church would profit by the experiences of the war and that hereafter a closer unity and co-operation would characterize all religious endeavor. Instead, it may be seriously doubted if there has been a time in the last twenty years when denominationalism has been more assertive. Its movements are more subtle just now because they lurk behind an attempted brotherliness. It is true, there is a real ache for Christian unity in the hearts of forward-looking churchmen, but the denominational appeals by the socalled Forward Movements of the religious bodies show that denominationalism has never been more active. The great mass of men outside the chruch care nothing for our denominational differences, and while it is true that the coming generation will more and more ignore them, at present denominational machinery is all we have with which to cope with conditions. If somehow we could get the denominations themselves to look outward rather than inward the challenge of a needy world might be sufficient to change the curve of endeavor. So long as the church constituencies are intent upon saving their several denominations, just so long will the church stand impotent in the presence of appalling need.

That organized denominationalism today seems destined to fail in winning the world constitutes our chief hope for tomorrow. Physicians sometimes tell us that when certain diseases have laid hold upon the body little can be done but to allow them to run their course. In other words, the patient must get sicker in order to recover. Denominationalism has about run its course. It is persistent because it is fighting its last battle. The throes of the present crisis in church life may be but the travail of a new birth which will compel the church to lose her life in order to save it to the Master's program. Our Lord's prayer for the union of all believers, reinforced by his life of lowly service, is the blazed trail along which the church must move to the redemption of the world.

It seems quite evident that for years to come the churches will not get together on polity. Doubless there is a growing spirit of democracy in church government, but those denominations in which democracy is least prominent seem to have distinct advantages in certain forms of government. Some day we shall make the discovery that there is one thing

vastly more important than any particular form of church polity, namely, to get the thing done that Christ wants done for the salvation of the world. Some day we shall learn that the church is only an expedient; that the Bible instead of handing down a finished form of church government, as Moses was given explicit direction for building the tabernacle, has rather enunciated the principles that must govern the body through which the Kingdom of God is to manifest itself.

Likewise it seems quite certain that we shall not unite on a sacramental basis. All religious communions are agreed that baptism and the Lord's Supper are rites to be observed in the church. A wide divergence of opinion exists concerning the eucharist, yet each denomination finds blessing and value in its own particular approach to this feast of love. The majority of churches to-day do not practice baptism as it was practiced in the first century, but the Lord seems to have set the seal of his approval upon other forms of committment by the individual that seek to enthrone righteousness and love in the life. Baptism stands for enlistment. It comes at the beginning of the Christian life. The cross, which constitutes the chief glory of Christ's life, is the thing to which he attaches most importance. The real service in which one presents his body a living sacrifice daily must follow baptism, and on this our Lord placed the true emphasis.

Nor does it now seem that we shall get together on church doctrines. Indeed this is the point at which the churches have wasted years in fruitless contention. What was the doctrine of Christ? Let any group of leaders come together and spend six months studying his life and program, and then outline his doctrine if they can. They will discover that a summary of this entire ministry could be made in a single sentence—God is your Father and all men are your brothers, and you must live and act in accordance with that truth. The Master's emphasis was on life, not doctrine. He predicated heaven and our assurance of it on one condition—that we serve the needs of his little ones. In that most graphic picture of the Judgment in the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew our Lord places the sheep upon the right and the goats upon the left, saying to those upon he left, "Depart," and to those upon the right, "Come inherit." Why? Because ye believed in the preached faith, repentance and baptism? Not so! Though the Master preached it, and would have us follow him in this. Because ye believe in the "restoration of primitive Christianity?" Not so! Although his simple form of life and teaching needs to be restored. Because ye preached Christian union? Not so! Notwithstanding the need of preaching and living this message. Read it with care. Come, because ye ministered to one of the least of my needy ones. Our passport then to heaven is obtained through service.

Canon E. W. Barnes in his Mayflower Tercentenary address in Westminster Abbey, according to *The Challenge*, London, said,

But we must tolerate divergence of standpoints, differences in modes of worship, which exist between ourselves, confident that truth will prevail over error and that different forms of worship correspond to diversities in religious temperament. There are diversities of gifts, but it is the same Spirit which quickeneth. As a means to religious unity persecution failed utterly. The story of the Pilgrim Fathers teaches that lesson conclusively. Conflict, semi-political, semi-theological, has been no more successful. It has merely weakened the religious vitality of the nation. It

has caused men who tried to be true followers of the Lord Jesus Christ to distrust one another when they ought eagerly to have sought fellowship in the Spirit. Real unity can only result from this same fellowship in the Spirit. Questions of organisation, of the precise value to be given to ancient symbols and traditions, are of subordinate importance. What transcends all is loyalty to the indwelling Spirit Who is the Lord Jesus Christ. The statement of orthodoxy which I set above any other I find in the fourteenth chapter of St. John's Gospel: "No man cometh unto the Father but by Me." "I am in the Father and the Father in Me." "I am in my Father and yet in Me and I in you." The test of orthodoxy, which no follower of the Lord can challenge, is "By their fruits ye shall know them." And the judgment upon orthodoxy is contained in the solemn words: "Not every man that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven."

Regarding episcopacy Principal W. B. Selbie, D. D., of Mansfield College, writing in *The Constructive Quarterly*, says,

"The question, however, is one which needs much further discussion, and there are many difficulties on the Nonconformist side which yet need to be removed. Secondly, the question of inter-communion is perhaps the most vital of all those that have been raised in the discussion hitherto. If there is any meaning in the admission of the equal status of all the denominations as parts of the Church of Christ it would naturally involve the admission of all duly qualified members of all the churches to the communion in any of the Churches. For the moment this need not carry with it what is known as inter-celebration, as to which there is a great hesitation in some quarters. If the first point were conceded as a matter of practice it would go a long way in the direction of the desired end. Thirdly, on the question of interchange of pulpits it may be said that probably too much has been made of this point. There is no wide-spread desire on either side for any such interchange save as an occasional and exceptional thing. It is felt, however, that where it is desired and where there is good reason for it, it ought to be possible to carry it out without regarding it as anything that needs apology or defence. This action would naturally follow from the acceptance of the equal status of the churches.

"The attitude of the Anglo-Catholics makes it very clear that the fundamental issue is one between the Catholic and Protestant ideals. Free Churchmen cannot consent to equate faith and order in the way that Anglo-Catholics seem to require. Nor can they allow the work of the Holy Spirit in the Churches to be lightly put on one side. That this work is real and effective Catholics seem willing enough to grant, but they do not seem to understand the implications of this concession, nor are they willing to follow out its logical conclusions. To fail to do this seems to be fighting against God, and while it is true that He is not tied to His Sacraments it is also true that where the fruits of His Spirit are manifest, it is not for men to put them on one side. The work of the Holy Spirit shows that in all the Churches there is already a fundamental spiritual unity. It would seem, therefore, the plain duty of Christians at the present time to discover some method of organization which will give proper and visible expression of that unity and secure the existence of one Church within which room may be found for wide diversities of gifts and operations. The best way to this will probably be to continue the process of conference and discussion which has now been

so well begun. Both sides need to learn very much more about their own deficiencies and about the advantages possessed by others. Both alike need to be still further convinced that unity is not merely expedient but right, and that only by securing it can the Churches fulfill the will of their Master.''

In Archbishop Du Vernet's recent charge to the Anglican Synod of the Diocese of Caledonia, he says,

For fifteen hundred years the spirit of God as the divine Administrator of the Church made use of the episcopal line of succession in the transmitting of the authority of the Church. This is strong presumptive evidence in its favor. But for the last five hundred years the same Spirit of God has abundantly demonstrated that His power is not tied to this episcopal line of succession, but overleaps the bounds of such narrow limitation. The old system of the historic episcopate must not be abandoned for it is still effective, but by the side of this we must make room for other systems of ecclesiastical order which have proved their worth.

The principle of historic continuity is essential but when the Spirit of Him Who is the same ''Yesterday, today and forever'' is manifestly working through the organism of some Church we have the highest guarantee of this essential continuity.

Loyalty to our Church traditions forces us to hold fast to the historic episcopate, but loyalty to the Spirit of Christ will not allow us to erect this piece of ecclesiastical machinery as a barrier in the way of Christian fellowship.

Social contact is the great solvent for religious prejudice. Let men of the different Churches come together for common worship and common work for the common cause of Christ and humanity, and the unity of the Spirit will be felt with such overwhelming power that the variety of men will no longer be an obstacle in the way of a comprehensive Church.

As one step in this direction I am glad to be able to say that in this Diocese we have made a beginning in the way of putting into operation two of the resolutions adopted by a joint-committee appointed by the Anglican Provincial Synod and the Presbyterian Provincial Synod of British Columbia, these resolutions having first received a general approval from both Synods. The resolutions are as follows:

''That before occupying new territory, where there are few settlers and there is little prospect of rapid growth, or where other special circumstances exist, conference be held between the Bishop of the Diocese and the Superintendent of Missions, so as to prevent overlapping during the pioneer stage, upon the clear and definite understanding that each communion reserves to itself the right to send a clergyman from time to time into such districts to administer the sacraments to its people.''

''That in cases of sparsely settled districts where missionaries of both communions are at work, services should be held either on different Sundays, or at different hours on the same Sunday, so as to avoid apparent conflict, and that the Bishop of the Diocese and the Superintendent of Missions should use their influence to promote such arrangements.''

Early last February the Superintendent of Presbyterian Missions and I, with map in hand, surveyed the territory covered by this Diocese and came to a mutual agreement in regard to many places in accordance with the terms of these two resolutions. As this Diocese consists of 200,000 square miles and our resources in men and money are so limited it is our bounden duty to coöperate with other Churches so as together minister to the spiritual needs of the people scattered over this vast territory.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE ENGLISH FEDERAL COUNCIL OF FREE CHURCHES ON THE LAMBETH APPEAL

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY:

Dear Sir:—I have read with much interest the above report as given in your last issue and I must confess my disappointment with the tone it manifests and the general stand it takes. Though courteous in its language and apparently appreciative of the spiritual character of the Lambeth Appeal, there is in it but little recognitin of the evils of division, or manifestation of eagerness to do away with them. Much less is there any acknowledgment of them as sinful, and not an expression of penitence for any share that their authors had in causing them, or themselves in perpetuating them. Whereas, the Lambeth bishops are most explicit in declaring their penitence and sorrow for anything that they or their predecessors may have done which in any way gave cause for their justification.

It seems to me that unless there comes to be a general and genuine recognition of the sinfulness of schism, there can be but little hope of the present ones being healed or future ones being prevented.

Then the claim is made that "Churches" are voluntary organizations of different kinds into which Christians have formed themselves on the reception of the "preaching of the Word," and that this conception must be accepted by all, before even the question of their union in one body can be "with propriety suggested." Now there can be no question on the part of any of the value of the preaching of the Gospel, for Christ commanded His Disciples to go into all the world and preach it to every creature, but why should that be exalted and the other command, given at the same time and by the same authority, to baptize, be ignored? And baptism means the admission into an organization, "a Body," as St. Paul calls it, in which there should be no divisions.

Here are two distinct conceptions as to the relations which should subsist between Christians. One is that they may associate themselves into any number of separate and different bodies having simply a spiritual union with one another; the other is that all should be members of one body, welded together, and having the same relationship to each other, as the varying members of a human body, and possessing the same efficiency. The latter has been the ideal at least of the vast majority of all Christians throughout the Christian centuries. The former conception of Christian relationship has come into vogue only among some Christians since the Protestant Reformation, and yet the demand is made that this idea must be accepted by all, before union even can be considered.

The claim is even made that those holding this view have a wider and larger Church fellowship than those who hold the other view because they are all willing to "partake of the same Holy Table." But if that Communion produces no unity of organization or action, as it has not, it is not of much use beyond the spiritual sense of fellowship it produces upon the individual recipients.

It is asked whether, if the Lambeth proposals were acted upon, it "would prevent or hamper continued recognition of sister Churches—in sacramental fellowship." The answer is, that every one would be

just as free as he is now to hold whatever conception of the Church he chooses, and to hold whatever Communion he desired with others, even with those who are not members of any Christian body. The Anglican claims he has that freedom now.

But to recognize all the varying Christian bodies as properly constituted Christian Churches, and that their relationship of Christians to each other is the normal and proper relation which should subsist among them, is a totally different question. The Lambeth Appeal is indeed to Christian fellowship, but it is insisted that where it exists it should lead to an organic unity. The various ministries and ordinances may be perfectly acceptable, and act as veritable means of grace, to those using them, but if they are not acceptable to all, then some means should be found by which all Christians could come under a common ministry and share common sacraments. And if there was a real will to do this, a way could be found.

The objection however is again raised by this report that an ordination that would be acceptable to all should not be required, but that all existing ministries should be "recognized." But ordination is the only means by which a ministry in the Church can be conferred, and if there is any doubtfulness on the part of some in regard to those ministries, should there not be a willingness shown to accept one which would be acceptable to all?

I doubt if there is a bishop in the Anglican communion who would not be willing to accept a conditional ordination from Greek or Roman bishops if their doubt of the validity of the Anglican orders, was the only obstacle to obtaining the inestimable blessing of organic union with either of those bodies. And should not Protestant clergymen show a like spirit towards Anglicans? We cannot understand their apparently invincible objection to the reception of another ordination to what they already have, if it would bring them into a wider fellowship and convey such inestimable benefits upon the Christian world.

As to the Episcopal form of government, the Report professes to have "an open mind," on the ground that it "does not regard one form of policy as essential to the Church Catholic or any part of it." But it is manifest that there can be no organic unity unless there is one form of government, and is it reasonable that the question of the correct form of government of the Christian Church should be determined by a plebiscite of some modern groups of Christians in the twentieth century of its existence? The all but universal acceptance of episcopacy throughout the Christian world for so many centuries, would seem to be sufficient reason for its acceptance.

We are glad to see that the Report seems to be in accord with Lambeth in regard to the reception of the historic creeds, as some individuals have declared their unwillingness to belonging to a body requiring a credal statement of any kind. And if those creeds are accepted as "a sufficient statement of the Christian faith," all should certainly be free to learn of the Holy Spirit all that it may have yet to teach the Church.

We are glad also to note the readiness of the Report to welcome liberty of use in regard to "forms of worship," as these have been at times strenuously objected to by many Protestants.

The truth is in regard to this question of reunion, that the generality of Protestants do not yet realize that the tendency to division is the inevitable result of the Protestant view, that Churches are only voluntary associations, which may be formed or modified at pleasure, that their existence alienates Christian from Christian, which is unchristian, and destroys the efficiency of the Church as an organ for the propaga-

tion of the Gospel. Until these truths are realized there can be but little hope of the union of all Christians in one body. But more and more are coming to this realization, and we can only continue to hope and work and pray that all may come to do so.

George Woolsey Hodge,
Philadelphia. (Anglican).

WORLD'S NEED OF CHRIST

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY:

Dear Sir:—"Whom do men say that I am?"—Mark 8:27, Luke 9:18. Are all prepared to-day to say bravely with St. Peter, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." St. Paul never tired of preaching Christ, the God-man crucified. Can the same be said of all Christian pulpits to-day? Have not some pulpits been used merely to discuss secular affairs? Strange that the world is well posted about all earthly facts and persons of note and the central fact is forgotten. Strange that God surprised the angels by coming here in human form and those for whom He came, suffered, and died are indifferent about that tremendous fact. Indeed we are a fallen and perverse, stupid and ungrateful generation, by being indifferent to the sacrifices of the God-man.

Were we entirely awake our leading occupation would be the study and admiration of the Redeemer of our earthly days. The world is extremely restless. The masses are in sore distress. The world has lost its equilibrium. Unhappiness is the companion of those who have all the comforts which this world can give them. Whence comes this sad condition? The day has been when the masses were happy with much less than is possessed to-day. The cause is easily found. Christ and His Gospel have been forgotten. The recent war made it plain that our young men know very little of the God-man. If their elder population were examined the same condition might prevail. What shall we say of the 20,000,000 school children who seldom hear the name of the great God-man who walked in this earth? What a sad condition to see 60,000,000 of our citizens churchless!

It should then be plain to all who have the interest of souls at heart to see the need of bringing Christ back to tre multitudes. Each day new plans for the reconstruction of the world are brought forward. Legislatures are having special sessions, at which plans are made for the betterment of mankind. Are they making much progress? When will they be convinced that outside of Jesus Christ there can be no peace or permanent reconstruction? If men were humble this would be plain to them. Only in the Christ can we have individual, social, industrial peace. With Christ alone is found the power to still the restless. Christian pulpits should realize the need of Christ if conditions are to be improved. It has been said that if Christian pulpits had been true to their trust and preached Christ crucified the late dreadful war would not now blacken the pages of history which our children will read with disgust. See the power the Christian pulpit could be! Will we allow the opportunity to pass by without exerting ourselves? The masses are crying, "What shall we do to be saved? To whom shall we go?" Show them the way to Christ who is the way, truth and life. Give them the pure word of Christ in lieu of that of men. The millions are on the brink of eternity. Is that no concern of ours? St. Augustine says, "Thou madest us for Thyself and our hearts are restless till they find rest in Thee."

The clear-sighted Gladstone saw the remedy for the ills of the world

only in Him who said, "Come to me all you who are heavy ladened and I will refresh you." Christ is the fountain of life, truth, peace and holiness. May Christian pulpits point out the direction to the only clear fountain. By so doing pulpits will not only lead to eternal happiness but the earthly peace also. Can there be a nobler calling than preaching Christ crucified to the restless masses?

Rectory Catholic Church, Raymond, Vernimont.
Denton, Texas.

OUR GREAT NATIONAL EMERGENCY

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY:

Dear Sir:—In the face of a world of unrest, with the nations of the world on the verge of moral bankruptcy, the question is frequently asked, what is the value of the Christian religion; what has it accomplished; what does it propose to do; and what is to be its future effect upon the human state. A demand is being made to-day for "Applied Christianity" for a religion that shall regenerate the citizenship of the nation, that shall hold the passion of men in leash, that shall turn a world of anarchy and unrest, of sin and strife, into a paradise of God. I suppose we are all willing to admit, that in the past the Christian Church has made many grave mistakes, and perhaps the chief reason has been because the Church has sought to live apart from its citizenship. We frequently hear it said, my citizenship is in heaven, and of course in a sense that is true, yet, if our religion doesn't help us to be better men, and help us to make a better community by reason of having lived in it, then I say to you, our religion is no good. Henry Ward Beecher was one time preaching on the "Power of the Gospel" to regenerate a human life, and at the close of the sermon he was approached by an Irish woman, who asked him if he meant what he said, to which Mr. Beecher replied that he meant every word of it; then said the Irish woman, "Well, begorra, I wish you'd try some of this here truck on my man Mike; for faith, he's beat me up three times already this week." If a man's religion doesn't help him to be the best kind of a citizen, or if it doesn't keep him from engaging in a business which is demoralizing to the manhood and womanhood of the nation, then there is something the matter with that man's religion; it's no good. But we still believe in the religion of the Christian Church, its Gospel is still the Power of God unto Salvation to every one that believeth, it still has the power to take men and women who in the past, have been a menace to the State and society, and transform them into good honest citizens, and I want to make a plea to-day, for the application of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, to every phase of social, industrial and economic life. Let us face a few facts. During the year 1919 the Interchurch World Movement through its department of survey, brought to light some facts that the Church of Jesus Christ cannot pass lightly by, neither can anyone who places any value upon their American citizenship. The report shows that there are five and one half millions of illiterates in the United States above nine years of age, that there are fifty-five millions above nine years of age not identified with any church, and that figure is conservative as compared with other reports; there are thirty-five millions of children under twenty-five years of age not enrolled in any Sunday-school, Protestant, Catholic and Jewish, and twenty-seven millions of these children are Protestant. The report further shows that if these three classes above were placed on review before the President, and should pass by in double column, at the rate

of twenty-five miles a day, it would take three and one half years for the procession to pass by. What an awful seed plot for immorality and crime. Now, what is the effect of this illiteracy and lack of religious education upon the youth of America? Follow the report further, and it shows, how in one city, in one week, there were one hundred and ninety-seven arrests under sixteen years of age, 182 boys and 15 girls, and 75 of these were children of American born parents. Classified according to age, there were 20 between the ages of eight and ten, 63 between the ages of 10 and 13, and 114 between the ages of 13 and 16, and the report states that the number of arrests for the week was below the average, the number for the year being above 10,000. These figures speak for themselves, they reveal the fact that the Church has failed to hold human passions in check, and to regenerate human society, they further show the need of something different.

But what are we going to do about it? How change these conditions? Somebody says, you must educate the people to see the awfulness of such conditions, yes but education in itself will not keep the people from sin, the only power that can do this is the religion of Jesus Christ, and His Church is the one institution ordained by Heaven, for the dispensing of that Grace, but somehow the Church seems helpless and inefficient. I believe the time has come when we must recognize the wicked waste and extravagance of sectarian duplication. I sometimes wonder how much longer the Christian world will tolerate such wickedness and folly. If a general in an army would divide up his forces in attacking an enemy like the Church is divided to-day in its attack upon worldliness, he would be sent to the insane asylum; yet the divided Church pursues with satisfaction and pride this insane policy against a greater enemy than any general ever led an army. Is it any wonder that the world war revealed the Church without a voice to check the tragedy of war, and not until we unify our Christian forces, shall the Church be able to make a lasting impression on the forces of evil. There is no longer any honor in one calling themselves by the name of Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Episcopalian or Catholic; the world needs Christians, and is wearily waiting for a display of the Spirit of Christ, realizing that his Spirit alone applied to our social, industrial and economic life, can prove the solution to a better state. We must recognize that the Church exists for the community, rather than that the community exists for the Church. Too long the Church has been saying to the community, give us your money, give us your time, give us your energy for the support of our cause; the community is now saying to the Church, what are you going to give back to us for all the money, and time and energy, we have been putting into you, during all these years of your existence, and no Church ought to be excused from declaring its right to existence and support.

Then we must have more time for religious education. Judge Fawcett of the Juvenile Court of New York City, tells how of 2,900 offenders arraigned before his court, he asked the question; How many of you have attended Sunday-school regularly for any given period of time, and he found that not one of the 2,900 were regular attendants, and he says he was so impressed with the good influence of the Sunday-school upon child life, that instead of confining these youthful offenders to a term in a penal institution, he sentenced them to one year of regular attendance at a good Sunday-school. But what chance does the Sunday-school teacher have to form Christian character in the lives of her pupils, when she has them only one-half hour per week for religious education, and the Sunday-school reports show that fully 50% of enrolled pupils only attend half time. Even if they attended regularly,

what chance has the teacher with only 26 hours for religious education, as compared with the 950 hours which the average child spends in the public school room each year.

The parents of the child must assume larger responsibility for the religious education of their children in the home, if the moral conditions referred to above are going to be any different than they are. It is estimated that the average child spends four-fifths of his time in his home, at least should do, and thus the home affords the best place in the world to instill the principles of Christian citizenship in the minds of our boys and girls. I never can understand why so many parents calling themselves Christians leave the religious education of their children to strangers, when it is their duty more than anybody's else to teach these things to their children.

Then we must build a statesmanlike programme of religious education, by securing trained religious teachers, who can make it worth while for the children to go to Sunday school, we must employ the function of teaching rather than preaching in our Churches and colleges, we must have teacher training classes for those who are to teach, we should make use of the vacation Bible school during the summer holidays, and last but not least, the establishment of parent training classes, seeking to bring the parents face to face with the dignity and sacred duties of parenthood.

Federated Church, J. T. Sharmon.
Bonami, La.

Organizations for the Promotion of Christian Unity

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Inc. Having its inception in the work of Thomas Campbell, 1809, present organization 1910, President, Rev. Peter Ainslie; Secretary, Rev. H. C. Armstrong, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. For intercessory prayer, friendly conferences and distribution of irenic literature, "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." Pentecost Sunday is the day named for special prayers for and sermons on Christian unity in all Churches.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, 1857, President, Athelstan Riley, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, London; Secretary in the United States, Rev. Calbraith Bourn Perry, Cambridge, N. Y. For intercessory prayer for the reunion of the Roman Catholic, Greek and Anglican Communions.

CHRISTIAN UNITY ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND, 1903, Secretary, Rev. Robert W. Weir, Edinburgh. For maintaining, fostering and expressing the consciousness of the underlying unity that is shared by many members of the different Churches in Scotland.

CHRISTIAN UNITY FOUNDATION, 1910, Secretary, Rev. W. C. Emhardt, Newtown, Bucks Co., Pa. For the promotion of Christian unity throughout the world by research and conference.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION, 1896, President, Prof. Percy Gardner; Hon. Secretary, Rev. C. Moxon, 3 St. George's Square, London S. W., England. For cultivation of friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian bodies.

COMMISSION ON THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, 1910, President, Rt. Rev. Charles P. Anderson; Secretary, Robert H. Gardiner, Esq., Gardiner, Me., U. S. A. For a world conference of all Christians relative to the unity of Christendom.

COUNCIL ON ORGANIC UNION, 1918, Ad Interim Committee, Chairman, Rev. W. H. Roberts, Philadelphia, Pa.; Secretary, Rev. Rufus W. Miller, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia. For the organic union of the Evangelical Churches in the United States of America.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, 1908, President, Rev. Frank Mason North; Secretary, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22d St., New York. For the coöperation of the various Protestant Communions in service rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity.

FREE CHURCH FELLOWSHIP, 1911, Rev. Malcolm Spencer, Colue Bridge House, Rickmansworth, London, N. For the cultivation of corporate prayer and thought for a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND, 1895, President, Rev. Principal W. B. Selbie, Mansfield College, Oxford; Secretary, Rev. F. B. Meyer, Memorial Hall, E. C., London. For facilitating fraternal intercourse and coöperation among the Evangelical Free Churches in England.

WORLD ALLIANCE FOR PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES, 1914, Chairman, Most Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury, Hon. Secretary, Rt. Hon. Sir Willoughby H. Dickinson, 41 Parliament St., London, S. W. 1. For joint endeavour to achieve the promotion of international friendship through the churches and the avoidance of war.

CB

OL. XI NO. 3

"God gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation."

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than of those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are friendly to all indications of Christian unity and ventures of faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour—are parts of the Church of Christ and that the unity of His disciples is the paramount issue of modern times.

JANUARY, 1922

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

2710 PINE STREET
ST. LOUIS, MO.

504 N. FULTON AVENUE
BALTIMORE, MD.

AGENTS:
Fleming H. Revell Company, *New York*
Maruzen Company, Ltd., *Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka* and *Sendai*
Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, *London, E. C. 4;* 100, Princes Street, *Edinburgh*

TWO DOLLARS A YEAR FIFTY CENTS A COPY

THE SPIRIT OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY

THE favorite figure in which the church of the first century set forth its conception of the Spirit of Christianity is that of "the Good Shepherd." The emblem which appears on this page is a reproduction of one of the early Christian gems.

"ONE FLOCK

ONE SHEPHERD."

"No one has written more appreciatively respecting this symbol than Dean Stanley in his *Christian Institutions*. It appealed to all his warmest sympathies. 'What,' he asks, 'is the test or sign of Christian popular belief, which in these earliest representations of Christianity is handed down to us as the most cherished, the all-sufficing, token of their creed? It is very simple, but it contains a great deal. It is a shepherd in the bloom of youth, with the crook, or a shepherd's pipe, in one hand, and on his shoulder a lamb, which he carefully carries, and holds with the other hand. We see at once who it is; we all know without being told. This, in that earliest chamber, or church of a Christian family, is the only sign of Christian life and Christian belief. But, as it is almost the only sign of Christian belief in this earliest catacomb, so it continues always the chief, always the prevailing sign, as long as those burial-places were used.'

"After alluding to the almost total neglect of this lovely symbol by the Fathers and Theologians, he says that it answers the question, what was the popular religion of the first Christians? 'It was, in one word, the religion of the Good Shepherd. The kindness, the courage, the love, the beauty, the grace, of the Good Shepherd, was to them, if we may so say, Prayer Book and Articles, Creed and Canons, all in one. They looked on that figure, and it conveyed to them all they wanted. As ages passed on, the Good Shepherd faded from the mind of the Christian world, and other emblems of the Christian faith have taken His place. Instead of the gracious and gentle Pastor, there came the Omnipotent Judge, or the crucified Sufferer or the Infant in His mother's arms, or the Master in His parting Supper, or the figures of innumerable saints and angels, or the elaborate expositions of the various forms of theological controversy.' But 'the Good Shepherd represents to us the joyful, cheerful side of Christianity of which we spoke before. . . . But that is the primitive conception of the Founder of Christianity in those earlier centuries when the first object of the Christian community was not to repel, but to include; not to condemn, but to save. The popular conception of Christ in the early church was of the strong, the joyous youth, of eternal growth, of immortal grace.' "—Frederic W. Farrar in *The Life of Christ as Represented in Art.*

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

A Journal in the Interest of Reconciliation in the Divided Church of Christ. Interdenominational and International. Each Communion may speak with Freedom for itself in these Pages as to what Offering it has to bring to the Altar of Reconciliation.

Vol. XI. JANUARY, 1922 No. 3

CONTENTS

DENOMINATIONAL DISARMAMENT 169
By Rev. J. J. Castleberry, Minister Walnut Hills Christian Church, Cincinnati, Ohio.

THE WAY TO A UNITED CHURCH 184
By Rt. Rev. G. H. Kinsolving, D.D., Bishop of Texas.

THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER AT GENEVA AND THE QUESTION OF THE UNION OF THE CHURCHES 194
By Nikolaos Evangelides (Metropolitan) of Nubia.

REUNION OF THE CHURCHES 216
By Rev. C. H. Shawe, Minister Moravian Church, Swindon, England.

THE LOST IDEAL. The Communion Table, as Observed by the Primitive Christians, a Basis for Church Unity 223
By Mason A. Green, Boston, Mass.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY . 233

BOOK REVIEWS 237

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is issued in January, April, July and October. It is the servant of the whole Church, irrespective of name or creed. It offers its pages as a forum to the entire Church of Christ for a frank and courteous discussion of those problems that have to do with the healing of our unchristian divisions. Its contributors and readers are in all communions.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, $2.00 a year—fifty cents a copy. Remittance should be made by New York draft, express order or money order.

Entered as second-class matter in the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo.

CHRISTIAN UNITY CALENDAR

PENTECOST SUNDAY has been named both by the World Conference on Faith and Order and the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity as the day for special sermons on Christian unity, along with prayers to that end.

THE Universal Week of Prayer January 1-7, 1922. For prayer topics write World's Evangelical Alliance, 19 Russell Square, London, W. C., 1.

MEETING of the World Conference on Faith and Order. Date and place unannounced. Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Me., secretary.

MEETING of the Universal Conference of the Church of Christ on Life and Work, perhaps in 1923 or 1924. Archbishop of Uppsala, president; Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City, secretary.

DIFFICULTY IN PRAYER

"The common complaint and regret of the devout is that they find prayer so difficult. There is earnestness and diligence; but little sense of progress and freedom. This grave matter has received consideration at the hands of many writers. It has been mainly approached from the side of the difficulty of prayer. Some are not troubled by scientific and philosophical difficulties. They only ask to be helped to see how they may better their praying. The deadness of prayer is due to a want of resolved lifting up of the soul to God—to lack of consciousness of God."

There is no principle of the heart that is more acceptable to God, than an universal fervent love to all mankind, wishing and praying for their happiness; because there is no principle of the heart that makes us more like God, who is love and goodness itself, and created all things for the enjoyment of happiness.—*W. Law.*

Ask and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you; for every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.—*Jesus.*

O Lord, in whom is the truth, help us, we entreat thee, to speak the truth in love, to hate a lie, to eschew exaggeration, inaccuracy, affectation. Yea, though tribulation or persecution should arise for the truth's sake, suffer us not to be offended. Amen.—*Christina G. Rossetti.*

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

EDITED BY PETER AINSLIE,
Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore, Md.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

RAYMOND CALKINS,
Pastor First Congregational Church, Cambridge, Mass.

J. A. CRAMER,
Minister Dutch Reformed Church, The Hague, Holland

ADOLF DEISSMANN
Professor in the University of Berlin, Germany

ALFRED E. GARVIE,
Principal of New College, University of London, London, England

HUGHELL FOSBROKE
Dean General Episcopal Theological Seminary, New York City

WILLIAM P. MERRILL
Minister Brick Presbyterian Church, New York City

GEORGE W. RICHARDS
President Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, Lancaster, Pa.

WILLIAM TEMPLE
Bishop of Manchester, England

NATHAN SÖDERBLOM,
Archbishop of Uppsala, Sweden

ALL editorial communications should be addressed to Peter Ainslie, Editor THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

SUBSCRIPTIONS may be sent direct or placed through Fleming H. Revell Company, New York City; Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai; Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, London, E. C. 4, or 100 Princes Street, Edinburgh.

SUBSCRIPTION price $2.00 a year—50 cents a copy.

CONTENTS OF

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

FOR OCTOBER, 1921

PROGRESS AND OBSTRUCTION IN CHURCH UNION IN EUROPE 89

By Professor Adolph Deissmann, D.D., University of Berlin, Berlin, Germany.

JESUS' IDEAL OF UNITY 109

By Rev. Seth W. Gilkey, D.D., Minister United Presbyterian Church, Bridgeport, Ohio.

THE PRESBYTERY OF MONTREAL AND CHRISTIAN UNION. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON REUNION OF THE CHURCHES IN RELATION TO THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE . . . 122

By Rev. Professor R. E. Welsh, D.D., Convener of the Committee of the Presbytery of Montreal.

THE CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN REUNION, HAVING REFERENCE TO DR. ARTHUR C. HEADLAM'S BAMPTON LECTURES FOR 1920 ON "THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN REUNION" 131

By Rev. Francis J. Hall, D.D., General Theological Seminary, New York City.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY 147

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR 155

A PRAYER

O LORD, the way seems farther to our brothers than to Thee. Whatever be our name or creed we come to Thee through Jesus Christ and we believe that we go away satisfied that our communion has been real. But it is not so in our approaches toward our brothers. Teach us then to find the path of penitence in order that we may no longer hinder Thy will among men, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THREE STAGES TO REUNION

I WOULD venture to suggest that there are three main stages requisite to Reunion; these stages have been indicated in our Lambeth report. I would call the first *Unity of heart*, the second *Unity of mind,* and the third *Unity of organic life.* And this order needs to be strictly observed. Some people would wish to rush the first two stages and begin arranging the third right here; others would say that so long as you have got the first you can afford to jump the second. Both those prescriptions would be disastrous, because Reunion of such a kind would fail to satisfy what I might almost call "the acid test", given us by Christ Himself—the very purpose of Unity, viz., that the Church should manifest to the world more effectively the divinity of her Incarnate Saviour.—*Roscow G. Shedden, Bishop of Nassau.*

A COMMON PATH OR NO PATH

THERE are grave difficulties in our approaches toward Christian unity because the heart of the Church is not right before God. We have strayed so far that it will be difficult to find the common path, but it is either a common path or no path, for separate paths for each communion are no paths at all. Jesus prayed for the oneness of His disciples. Shall it be said that it is the will of God to hold back the answer to that prayer or shall we confess that the will of man has blocked the way?

DENOMINATIONAL DISARMAMENT*

We are living without question in the greatest and most challenging period of the world's history—a day big with ideals, with deeds and with destiny—God's day and ours. How tragic, therefore, and out of joint with the fitness of things in this great day of the world's rebuilding for one to think, to feel or to do in a petty and unworthy way or to motive his life by other than the highest and best.

The war has thrust upon us anew three great problems: one is political and involves international relationships; another is economic and looks to industrial rehabilitation; while the third is religious and has to do with Christian unity.

The Crime of Christendom

The crime of Christendom is the divided Church of God. Witness the spectacle. The Christian Church is marked by three great cleavages—the Greek Catholic, the Roman Catholic and the Protestant—each rooted in ancient prejudices and therefore hostile one toward the other. Then Protestantism is divided and subdivided, presenting the sorry spectacle of scores of denominations and petty sects and parties, each lifting its feeble and pusillanimous cry, "Lo here" and "Lo there." Too often indeed particular bodies are rent by unholy schism, and that for the most trivial and supercilious reasons. Thus the spiritual body of Christ is broken and mangled and lacerated even worse than was His physical body two thousand years ago on the hill outside Jerusalem.

What tragedy, that when a world was swept into the maelstrom of war and all the Titans of darkness bent on destruction, there was no great, commanding voice

*Address delivered at the International Convention of Disciples of Christ, Winona Lake, Indiana, September 4, 1921.

through which the collective conscience of Christendom could speak, either in protest or appeal. In the final appraisement of that horrible struggle its darkest page will be, not the invasion of Belgium or the nameless atrocities in France—diabolical as these things were—but rather that such a war was fought and the world crimsoned in blood without any united or effective effort of the Christian Church against it.

All this not only demonstrates the impotency of division, but what is more its unspeakable shame, its crime against God and humanity!

Now over against this condition of sectism and weakness let us put the testimony of Jesus and His holy apostles. The ideal of unity is so pronounced in our Lord's utterances that anything else seems flagrant betrayal. For example, in the universal prayer He taught us to say, "Our Father"—not "my" or "mine," but "our Father"—thereby implying that we are all brothers and sisters. Again, "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and they shall become one flock, one shepherd." Or again, under the very shadow of the cross, with its bitter anguish and flow of blood, in sublime intercession, He poured out His great soul: "Holy Father . . . I pray that they may all be one; even as Thou, Father, art in me and I in Thee, that they also may be in us; that the world may believe that Thou didst send me." Likewise Paul, in words of fire, protested against divisions at Corinth, attributing them to carnality; and later in tender appeal he urged the Ephesian Christians to "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

How far indeed we have departed from this New Testament ideal and done violence to the mind of the Son of God! Who can contemplate our backsliding and low falling without a deep sense of humiliation and disgrace?

"Oh Christ, the world still turns to Thee,
A beacon in the night;
Though human creeds and loveless deeds
Have clouded Thy true light.

"Shine forth! With Thy clear face
Dispel the doubts that now betide,
Till faith and hope abound with men
And love in each abide."

The Disciples and Unity

It is the unique distinction of the Disciples of Christ that our movement was born out of the passion for a reunited Church. True, certain envisioned souls through all the Christian centuries have seen the evil of division and cried out against it—men like Tertullian and Augustine, Bernard and George Calixtus, Richard Baxter and Robert Hall. Bernard said, "Who can grant me before I die to see the Church of God such as she has been in primitive times?" George Calixtus declared, "I will spare neither my life nor my blood, if so be I may purchase the peace of the Church." And Robert Hall referred to schism as the "rending of the seamless coat of our Saviour and by far the greatest calamity that has befallen the Christian interest."

But a hundred years ago these scattered voices became a mighty chorus and these isolated lights fused into a consuming flame. Here in the New World—for the first time since Pentecost—a great movement sprung forth out of the impulse and with the definite plea for Christian unity. Read again the "Declaration and Address" by Thomas Campbell, every word athrob with the passion for a reunited Church. The thesis of this memorable document is that the Church of Christ on earth is essentially, intentionally and constitutionally one; that there ought to be no schisms in the Church; and that nothing

should be considered an article of faith except what is expressly taught and enjoined in the Word of God. "With you all," he declared, "we desire to unite in the bonds of an entire Christian unity. Later Thomas Campbell's gifted son, Alexander, threw the weight of his great personality and influence into the movement and with unrivaled eloquence pleaded for reconciliation. "Nothing," said he, "is essential to the conversion of the world but the unity and coöperation of Christians; and nothing is essential to the unity of Christians but the apostles' teaching or testimony."

Our historic mission therefore, as charted by the fathers, is sun clear. It is not primarily to restore the Bible —others believe in it profoundly; neither is it to restore Christ—others love and honor Him with unswerving devotion; nor is it to restore baptism—others plead insistently for this New Testament ordinance; and even the idea of restoring the apostolic Church came as a later development in our history. But the original impulse of our movement and the essential genius of our plea is that of peacemakers; it is to bind up the broken body of our Lord, who has been crucified afresh and put to an open shame. "To this end were we born and for this purpose came we into the world."

But now after a century of history, committed all the while to the inspiring, thrilling task of uniting a divided Christendom, the Disciples to-day are confronted by certain dangers, grave and serious.

First, there is danger of losing our vision, and through over-emphasis upon secondary matters reducing ourselves to the status of a sect or denomination, and that of the most reactionary and objectionable type. We have taken a great, universal ideal and institutionalized it—perhaps indeed necessarily—but have we not thereby narrowed it to inevitable limitations? Thus we talk about "our brotherhood," "our plea," "our conventions,"

"our societies"—all of which is the dialect of division. The dream of Jesus was a dream of the Kingdom. Only twice did He speak of the Church, but again and again He insisted on the Kingdom. This was His central idea and ruling passion, as with Moses it was law, or with Confucius it was morality, or with Socrates, the soul. We need to get back to this fundamental concept of Christ and think in terms of the Kingdom, the reign of God on earth.

There is likewise danger of losing our leadership, and through a policy of isolation and non-coöperation lapsing into a negligible force in the Christian world, misunderstood, if not indeed mistrusted. We are pioneers in the promotion of unity, and it belongs to us to lead the procession; it is our right by decree of history and the fate of circumstance—yes, and by the call of God. But if, like the blind man at the pool of Siloam, we hold back and timidly wait, others shall pass ahead of us into the agitated and healing waters.

Further, there is danger of losing not only our vision and leadership, but our testimony as well, and that through failure to exemplify unity among ourselves. Even now the census lists us as two bodies, divided over the most puerile and inconsequential matters. But this fact is too sad to dwell upon! Surely Christ's prayer for the oneness of His followers applies to a group as well as to the whole of Christendom. For a hundred years our fathers, with trumpet voices, have pleaded for a united Church, urging this as the final condition to the evangelization of the race. Shall we not demonstrate the glory of this plea by remaining ourselves a united brotherhood —a unity based upon loyalty to and liberty in Jesus Christ, and cemented forever by love? Let the heart of a great people to-day cry out with one voice:

"Faith of our fathers, holy faith
We will be true to thee till death."

The Basis of Unity

What is the basis of Christian unity? I mean rather, along what lines can this ideal be worked out and realized?

To approach the problem negatively, let me say, unity cannot come by *compromise*—that is, of anything vital and essential. Nothing is settled permanently until it is settled right. To force the issue is to defeat the aim; indeed it cannot be forced any more than the healing of a wound can be forced. "It is not by power, nor by might, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord." It must therefore come by the working of the Spirit of God; the operation of silent influences in men's hearts—love, goodwill and Christian charity.

It is not by *reversion to the past.* Indeed the restoration of primitive Christianity in its high reaches of catholic truth, spiritual idealism and missionary passion were a glorious dream, and blessed is he who catches the vision and follows its gleam; but to reproduce the apostolic Church in outward detail of accident and circumstance were as impossible as it would be impracticable. Can the plant go back to the seed, or the oak to the acorn, or the butterfly to the chrysalis? Does the astronomer go back to Kepler, the physician to Hippocrates, or the artist to the crude etching on some ancient tomb? Indeed would we want to go back, for example, to the communism of the Jerusalem Church, to the legalism of the Church at Antioch, or to the strife and division of the Church at Corinth? No, the way to unity is not backward, except as we may incarnate the ideals of the early Christian society; but it is forward, forward, and that under the guidance of the divine Spirit in Jesus Christ.

It is not by *intellectual uniformity.* That likewise is

not only impossible, but it is undesirable as well; and if this principle were followed to the ultimate it would turn back the dial of civilization thousands of years. Suppose it had maintained in the field of pure science—then we would still believe that the earth is flat and be studying the stars in order to discover the destiny of man; or in medicine—then we would still be ignorant of the circulation of the blood and the beneficent use of anaesthetics; or in religion—then there would be no Jesus or Luther or Campbell, with all the blessings that follow in their train.

There will always be, as in the past, diversity of judgment and interpretation. Unity can never come by intellectual formula. From the days of Athanasius to the present men have tried standards and rubrics, imposed from without; but the further we have gone the more hopelessly divided we have become. The great creeds of Christendon, hoary with age and fragrant with sentiment, have been far more divisive than they have been unifying.

Turning now to the positive side, if unity ever come—as come it must—it will be along three lines.

To begin with, it is a *biological* process. That is to say, it is a growth, a growth from within, and a growth toward God. It cannot be thrust upon us by arbitrary or mechanical methods. No edict of pope or vote of council or convention can bring it about. It is something vital, and therefore it must be achieved, and that in accord with the great universal law of nature and of life.

In the second place, unity must come by *spiritual cohesion.* And even now there are two great influences at work in this direction—one from within and the other from without—moulding God's people into oneness.

The first of these is the unifying power of true, spiritual religion. The only unity worth having is that which centers in and springs from the great deeps of religious experience. Jesus interpreted religion in terms of spiritual values. To Him it did not consist in empty forms

or meaningless dogmas—the "tithing of mint, anise and cummin;" but it was inner and experiential—the life of God in the soul of man. "The Kingdom," said He, "is within you."

The word "religion" means literally "to bind," "to bind fast." Hence it is the great unifying and organizing principle of life—of all the interests, values and relations of life. There must, therefore, be this inner tie binding heart to heart—a unity of the Spirit—before there can be any true and lasting unity.

Thus all of us claim kinship with the great saints of the past, regardless of their theological bias or relations —Francis, Newman, Wesley and Livingstone. We sing their hymns, exalt their faith and tell the story of their beautiful lives to our children. Indeed, does not the spiritually-minded Disciple feel closer to the spiritually-minded Baptist or Presbyterian than he does to the worldly-minded Disciple? "Whosoever," said the Master, "shall do the will of God, the same is my brother and sister and mother."

"Oh, brother man, fold to thy heart thy brothers;
Where pity dwells the peace of God is there;
To worship rightly is to love each other,
Each smile a hymn, each kindly deed a prayer."

The other influence working towards spiritual cohesion is the gigantic, staggering task of saving a lost world—lost physically, lost intellectually, lost socially, and lost morally. It presents a task so stupendous that no single group of Christians can accomplish it alone, as one nation could not have won the war. The whole task must be attacked by the whole Church, else irretrievable failure shall mock us.

Yes, brethren, the world is lost. It sits to-day amid the wreck and ashes of its own undoing. Its head is bowed and sorrow furrows its face. If then argument

will not convince, if the prayer of our Lord means naught, I hold up before you a broken, bleeding world, and beg that for its sake the divided Church of God get together, united in Jesus Christ, and go forward—

"Fair as the moon,
Bright as the sun,
Terrible as an army with banners."

Thirdly, it remains to be said that Christian unity looking to a universal end can be realized only on a *universal basis*. It must sweep the entire horizon of truth, grounding itself in the great catholicities of our Christian faith. Nothing else will appeal to our modern age or break down the barriers of centuries.

All this, like the varied colors of the rainbow converging in a single ray of light, is summed up and focalized in the universal creed of Christianity; namely, "Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God." This is a living, growing, divine, eternal creed, and it is the only creed under heaven one is required to subscribe to—be he minister, professor, secretary, or missionary. It is not a matter of syllogism or theology, but of a Divine Personage. Whoever believes in Jesus Christ, and is loyal to Him, is my brother and comrade. In Him—God's ideal man and man's ideal God—is found the glorious and altogether adequate synthesis of all our faiths and philosophies.

"Not what, but Whom, I do believe,
That in my darkest hour of need
Hath comfort that no mortal creed
To mortal man may give.

"Not what, but Whom!
For Christ is more than all the creeds,
And His full life of gentle deeds
Shall all the creeds outlive."

A Challenge to Disciples

I love the Disciples of Christ. I believe in our movement—its ideals and its destiny. Surely it was born of God and at the right time. But now after a century of history there comes to us a great, new challenge—a challenge borne on every wind that blows; a challenge loud as the thunders of Sinai and sweet as the whisperings of Calvary; a challenge springing fresh out of the heart of this generation. It is a call to our ancient moorings, to a reassertion of the impulse out of which we were born and a recommitment to the ideal which has led us as a pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night through all the years; namely, to plead for the unity of the divided family of God.

It is a challenge to *think* unity. The greatest power in this world is thought. It is the source and dynamic of all achievement, as the bud precedes the blossom or as the seed precedes the harvest.

What is nature but thought materialized? Indeed, this great universe with its blazing suns and whirling planets, was once but a thought in the mind of the Creator. What is art but thought thrown on canvas, chiseled in the marble or sung in oratorio? What is science but the discovery of the thoughts of God and the thinking of those thoughts after Him? What is literature but thought articulated in language, expressed in terms of life and poured out on the printed page? What is war but thought coming into conflict on the field of battle and making the land billowy with graves? What is government but thought organized into laws, binding together people of kindred spirit and ideals and looking to the common weal of the body politic? What is religion but thought embodied in creed, incarnated in life and tested by experience? Christianity, with its whole great complex of ideals, teachings and influences, is traceable back to a single thought in the mind of a Galilean peasant;

namely, a divine kingdom on earth—a kingdom whose throne is the human soul, whose crown is love, whose sceptre is righteousness and whose end is the conquest of the whole world.

Indeed, when God would lift up a nation, regenerate a race or save a world He drops some great thought into the mind of a leader, and lo, the work is done. He dropped the thought of liberty into the mind of Cromwell, hence the destruction of that citadel of iniquity known as the "divine right of kings;" He dropped the thought of democracy into the mind of Washington, hence there sprang up in this western wilderness the world's greatest republic, at once the hope, the inspiration and the guiding star of all humanity; He dropped the thought of inalienable human rights into the mind of Lincoln, hence by one master stroke the shackles of slavery fell from two millions of our brothers in black; He dropped the thought of altruism into the mind of McKinley, hence Spanish tyranny was driven forever from the subject and bleeding island of Cuba; He dropped the thought of world peace into the mind of Woodrow Wilson and Warren G. Harding, hence we look forward to the fulfilment of the poet's dream when

"The war-drum throbbed no longer, and the battle flags were furl'd
In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the World."

So Christian unity must take deep root alike in the individual and collective consciousness of our great brotherhood. We must think unity and this will direct our whole attitude and effort toward its realization, for "as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he."

It is a challenge to *feel* unity, for, after all, it is not so much what we believe as what we feel and purpose and do. We must recognize at the outset the unity that

already exists and build upon it. For in the great fundamentals we are nearer together than some would acknowledge. Do we not believe in the same God, our Father? In the same Christ our Saviour? In the same Holy Spirit, our Comforter? In the same Bible, our inspired guide? In the same heaven, our eternal home?

Moreover, the conditions which brought about our historic cleavages in the main exist no longer, just as slavery which precipitated the Civil War is gone forever. Thus we should be forbearing toward our brothers—ready at all times to counsel together in the spirit of our Elder Brother.

There should be a new approach to the whole union question; namely, upon our knees. This was the method of Jesus and we too must wrestle with it in prayer, surrendering ourselves to the will of God, crying out in utter abandon, "Not my will, but in all things Thine be done." When the divided children of God face the problem in this spirit—praying over it, really, truly praying over it and praying together—then the glorious consummation will have come.

Further, there must be self-dedication to the task. "For their sakes," said the Master, "I sanctify myself," and with these words upon His lips He passed through Gethsemane and poured out His life upon Calvary. Sacrifice, always and everywhere, is the law of life and progress—the sacrifice of the lower to the higher good. The seed dies that the plant may bud and blossom; the mountian is made bare that the valley may become fertile and fruitful; the martyr yields to flaming fagot that from his ashes the cause of truth may spring forth and flourish; the patriot bares his breast to screaming steel that by his blood humanity may have a new birth of freedom. Likewise must the Church of Jesus Christ hear the call of the cross, dedicating itself to the world's deeper need,

losing its life that it may thereby find it in greater growth and achievement.

It is a challenge to *practice* unity. Brethren, are we not derelict just here? It is far easier to talk about unity than it is to practice it ourselves.

The psychologist tells us that expression follows impression, and that that which does not find expression languishes and dies. Art, music, faith and love—all these must express themselves, definitely and concretely, else they perish. So we must translate our vision into reality, clothing our ideal in flesh and blood.

The whole Christian society to-day acknowledges the evil of division; that it misrepresents the Spirit of Christ; that it is at variance with the growing social consciousness of the time; and that it renders the Church impotent to grapple with the present world situation. But to recognize the disease is not to cure it. We must go forth to smite and destroy and heal, giving expression in every possible, right way to our desire for unity.

All this, be it said, means denominational disarmament and the cultivation of the arts of peace; for surely unity signifies more than an armed truce. If the maintenance of great war machinery, with its panoplied soldiers and bristling bayonets, creates dangerous suspicions and jealousies among nations, will not this principle produce the same pernicious result in religion? Men everywhere to-day are weary and heart-sore of animosities; they are yearning for something better. Eight million graves in Flanders and France cry out against war; a hundred million hungry stomachs and bleeding hearts cry out against war; a world soaked in blood and groaning under intolerable debt cries out against war; and even now, thank God, statesmen are planning for an international conference at Washington, looking to the destruction of this damnable scourge of mankind. Surely the children of

this world shall not prove wiser than the children of light!

Let us then, O Church of the living Christ, rise higher than traditional cleavages and inherited hatreds, and as free sons of God go forward, thinking, feeling and practicing unity, thereby fulfilling our divine mission to this new and destiny-making age. If these ideals are carried out sincerely, humbly, prayerfully, Christian unity will come—come silently as the stars, unobtrusively as the dawn, surely as the sunrise, and fraught with blessings as the summer showers.

Fellow Disciples: I am hopeful—profoundly hopeful—a hope born of faith. I believe in God—a living, immanent God,

> "Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns
> And the round ocean, and the living air,
> And the pure sky, and in the mind of man."

I believe in the Divine Spirit, and that it broods over the hearts of men to-day, softening our hatreds and integrating our purposes, even as it brooded over the ancient chaos out of which a world of law and order and harmony came forth. I believe in my brethren of every creed and cult, their nobility, their spiritual vision and hunger for fellowship. I believe in Christ—a victorious, achieving Christ—and that His intercessory prayer will yet be answered in a united Church.

Just after the French Revolution, near the close of the eighteenth century, the Sultan of Turkey visited Paris. Seeing a broken and disfigured statue of Christ in front of an erstwhile cathedral he sneeringly remarked, "Sire, your day is past"—and so it seemed amid the wreck and disaster wrought by internecine war. Years afterwards Thomas Carlyle was in Paris and chanced to look upon the self-same image, now reproduced and perfect, looking down upon the multitudes with commanding impres-

siveness as if again about to speak his mighty imperative. Addressing it in profound reverence the great Scotsman said, "Sire, your day is yet to come."

Ah, the Christian prophet spoke more discerningly than did the pagan ruler. Christ's day is indeed to come, and we are waiting for it, waiting for it as watchmen wait for the morning. Even now there are signs of the dawn, and with it a new world is being born—a world ruled by Him of the thorn crown and the borrowed tomb; a world of peace and goodwill and brotherhood—a new world wherein dwelleth righteousness.

Inspired by this vision may we go back to our fields with courage and high hope; and as the hand takes up the task—so heavy and at times unyielding—let the heart sing

"All hail the power of Jesus' name,
Let angels prostrate fall;
Bring forth the royal diadem
And crown Him, crown Him, crown Him
Lord of all."

J. J. Castleberry.

Walnut Hills Christian Church
Cincinnati, Ohio.

WHY?

WHY do we follow, like a flock of sheep,
Tradition with a crook,
Or leave the vastness of the calling deep
To paddle in a brook;
When on the hills of sunrise stands the Lord—
Triumphant with a lifted flaming sword?

Why, when upon our lips the great new name
Waits eager to be said;
When cloven tongues of Pentecostal flame
Burn over every head:
Do we build Babel towers to the sky
From bricks and mortar, who have wings to fly?

—*Robert Norwood*

THE WAY TO A UNITED CHURCH

May I not assume at the outset that under any definition of the term, the one Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, in which all Christians believe, is not as much at unity in its various parts and branches as is desirable, or as is required by the teaching of the New Testament, and particularly as that teaching is exemplified in such language as our text, and also for example in such a kindred passage as the prayer of our divine Master when He says: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me." In the light of such teaching, no one perhaps, would gainsay the statement that the body of Christ is divided, is rent and torn in pieces to a degree, which, upon the contemplation of it, must always carry shame and sorrow to the hearts of all true and earnest-minded people. We believe that it could be demonstrated without much argument that the will of Christ calls for a deeper, truer and more substantial union of His people than they are wont to exemplify in the outward manifestations of Church organization and life. It is a subject of just reproach against Christianity that those who profess to believe in it are divided into innumerable sects and parties, which, making all due allowance for legitimate differences and diversity, are not compatible with even the most moderate requirements of oneness in our fellowship in the household of faith. Christ's flock is a scattered one. His prayer to His Father that His disciples might be one is not realized save in a very imperfect manner in the spiritual and organic life of the Church.

The desire for unity, therefore, in the first place, is based upon the fact that unity in His body, in His flock,

is in accordance with the will of Christ. It is taught us in the New Testament, and is urged upon us in some of the sweetest and noblest passages in the Gospels and Epistles, and constituted the subject-matter of the most touching portion of our Lord's dying prayer for His Church: and to thwart the will of Christ is sin. To seek to fulfil it should be the chief desire of the human soul.

Again, this desire for unity is enhanced by the fact that the lack of unity is itself a source of incalculable evil to the Church, aside from the question of the divine requirements to the contrary. Unity is strength. Division is weakness. The motto of one of our Western States contains a perfectly sound principle when applied to the Church: "United we stand; divided we fall." The Church is strong up to the point where she is united. She is weak from the point where she is divided. The Church broken up into many detachments can neither resist the attacks of the enemy with half her effectiveness, nor can she in turn assault the strongholds of sin with that concentration of effort which is so essential to great achievement and permanent success. Every regiment and division in the army of Christ may fight bravely and may win many victories. Each one of them has won many glorious and magnificent victories, and they have been led by grand heroes and men of renown. But until they can present a more solid front, and unite with a common purpose in view, they will remain at a great disadvantage, and the contest will be prolonged at endless cost and sacrifice.

Nearly every battle in any serious war is lost or won by either side in large measure, owing to a lack of concert of action on the part of the different bodies of troops at the time of attack, and to a scattered fire of the guns, instead of massing them in a proper manner and at the right place. In our spiritual warfare the same principle holds true, only the mistakes in our warfare are always

on our side. Satan rarely, if ever, plays the part of a bad general, and he seldom imitates the Christian's method of doing battle. For this reason mainly has he been able to resist so long and so successfully a power which if wisely used, and as commanded by the Great Captain of our Salvation, would long since have overthrown him with a mighty destruction. Alas! how the Christian Church has wasted her resources and exhausted her strength in guerrilla raids and free lance fighting; and how often have her soldiers forgotten the presence and power of their real foes, and turned their guns upon each other, or like Achilles have sulked in their sectarian ships and left their comrades and friends to take care of themselves, and with their rivalries and jealousies have often brought defeat and disgrace upon a righteous cause.

Of course I could multiply such considerations indefinitely. Let these suffice to illustrate the evils of division and serve as a brief explanation of why unity is desirable.

But now the question arises, What is unity? What do we mean by one body, or one fold under one Shepherd? This question has been answered in three ways. There have been three forms which the conception of unity took in those periods of the Church's existence when her unity was preserved in all essential respects. Dr. Hatch, in his Bampton Lectures has contended that in the earliest period the basis of Christian fellowship was a changed life, repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ. "It was the unity of a common relation to a common ideal and a common hope. 'By their fruits ye shall know them' was the bond which knit together the whole body of Christ's chosen ones."

In the second period "the idea of definite belief as a basis of union dominated over that of a holy life. The meshes of the net were found to be too wide. The simple creed of primitive days tended to evaporate into the mists of a speculative theology. It became necessary to define

more closely the circle of admissible beliefs. The contention of those who looked upon Christians as a whole was that they were held together by their possession of a true and the only true tradition of Christian teaching."

In the third period "insistence on Catholic faith had led to insistence on Catholic order, for without order dogma had no guarantee of permanence. Consequently the idea of unity in a general and common order was superimposed upon that of unity of belief. It was held not to be enough for a man to be living a good life and to hold to the Catholic faith and to belong to a Christian association: that association must be part of a larger confederation and the sum of such confederations constituted the Catholic Church."

This threefold conception of unity has had still another phase added by the Church of the Middle Ages, which, seeking to carry to the utmost verge of logic this last conception, insisted upon absolute uniformity in all outward as well as inward matters; and in the place of alliance or confederation, with free play for diversity and individualism, the idea of complete centralization was urged, and the one body was to be made one, not only in spirit, and in its general aims and principles, but one in shape and form in all particulars, even to the extent of dress, forms of worship, and the same language and subservience to one earthly head, all powerful and infallible. When the dominant portion of this ambitious Church began to enforce this conception of unity as a substitute for the primitive and Catholic ideas, as a matter of course it defeated its own object, and split the Church into fragments, first alienating the mother of all Churches, the oriental and Greek Church; and in the days of the Reformation driving into a struggle for freedom and independence all the civilized and enlightened nations of Europe, and ever since those days it has been impossible for the different portions of the body thus sundered to

come together again on any common basis of mutual agreement and brotherly fellowship and outward recognition. In our day, however, now that the Christian world has in large measure recovered from the shock and tumult of those years of bitter contention and controversy, recognizing the appalling disasters which have recently fallen upon civilization, and alarmed at the forces round about us threatening to overthrow and destroy all religion and even all rational human government itself, thousands and tens of thousands of devout hearts in every portion of the Church are beginning to long for a more satisfactory condition of things with reference to their relations to each other, as disciples and followers of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The past history of the Church has shown that all the unity which is needed or desirable can be attained along the lines of the threefold conception of it, of which we have spoken. For the first four hundred years of her existence the Church was essentially one fold under one Shepherd, united on the threefold basis of a holy life, a common faith, and a common order; and her work during that period was simply marvelous. Our own Church, together with the bishops of the whole Anglican communion in conference assembled, has proposed to all other bodies of Christians, Greek, Roman and Protestant, to consider this tremendous question of Catholic unity, and to pray over it, until in God's good time and way we may come together again on the old historic basis, which once held the Church together, and would have continued to do so through the ages had not political ideas and complications overshadowed and weakened, and finally destroyed such bonds. We have at times dared indulge the dream that just as political ideas in the Roman Empire were the means of destroying the outward body of the Church by attempting excessive consolidation and emperializing it and placing itself on Caesar's throne, so

may God use the political ideas of this great American Republic with the democratic tendencies of our day as the means of human government, inspiring us with ideals which may give us back the precious heritage of which it robbed us—the heritage of unity in diversity, of many in one and one in many. The very idea of democracy is not only liberty and equality, but fraternity—fraternity not only in social and political affairs; but if Christians are to come together and do their work in the world, fraternity must be especially in religion. We call our land of America the *New* World and we are seeking to make men everywhere partakers in our brotherhood, sharers in a federation of democracy which will ultimately embrace the human family. Why then can we not unite the forces of Christianity, and seek to spread our religion by substituting in the place of the selfish system of competition the new conception of coöperation and interrelationship? Governments are doing this to save themselves and civilization. Why cannot the Church work on the same lines to save itself and the whole race of man?

Alas! though, no one can think of this vast subject without being confronted on every hand by the most formidable difficulties. The more we study human nature and human history the less do we find to comfort us. And were it a mere question of human management and solution it would require a very sanguine temperament in any man to be very cheerful and hopeful regarding the present and future unity of the Christian Church. And yet, because all things are possible with God, and because it is clearly the revealed will of Christ that His people should be one, and because they are one in two of the three requirements of unity, the requirement of a holy life and substantial agreement in the fundamental articles of faith, we are encouraged to look forward to the time when there will be such a thing as organic unity also.

The unity of Christendom should not overtax our expectations any more than does almost every other question with which as Christians we have to deal. When the first apostles received their commission: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel, making disciples of all nations and baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost," the problem which confronted them made demands upon faith as compared with which the difficulties in the way of Church unity are as nothing. Yet God was with them and He brought mighty things to pass through their instrumentality. This same God is our God forever, and the weakness of our faith should never be the measure of His strength, except when as individuals or as Churches we refuse to do His will, or to give ourselves as instruments to carry out His purposes; even then God often does His work in spite of us and without our help.

Therefore the duty which is laid upon each one of us is, when we are asked to consider the subject of unity, that we are not to dispose of it with an easy and incredulous shrug of the shoulder, and say to ourselves, Ah! such a thing can never be. It is visionary. It is impossible. Remember that the Jew expressed just such sentiments concerning salvation through the Cross. The Greek laughed at the idea of the resurrection. The disciples might have reasoned in that manner and never have undertaken the conversion of the world. If it is God's will to unite His Church, move in the current of that will, and do not allow your intolerance to cause you to fight against God.

And again, seek by prayer and honest self-examination to know your own heart in its relation to the different matters about which you disagree with other Christians. Many of our differences are real and they concern questions of deeper moment than mere misunderstandings and prejudices. Still much of the bitterness of feeling and the strife and discord which these differences en-

gender have their origin in a loveless and prayerless heart, and in a mind which does not know itself as it should. Our differences may grieve and pain us. They ought never to make us rancorous and contemptuous. Even when those who differ from us seem to fail in this respect, he begins the fight who strikes back; and a soft answer not only turns away wrath but often accomplishes what the strongest blow could not effect.

And more than all else each one of us has it in his power to help on the cause of Christian unity by deepening in his heart a true and abiding spirit of unity, and to rejoice in that spirit when manifested by others from whom he differs in outward things. Just as there may be a diversity of spirit in unity of form so may there be a very genuine unity of spirit in diversity of form, and this unity of spirit is a quality which every Christian should seek after in all sincerity, and he should be glad and recognize it fully whenever and wherever he finds it. Many a sheep which belongs to the Good Shepherd's flock may not have quite the outward mark for which we are looking; and yet if he knows the Shepherd's voice, and if we see that the Shepherd speaks to him, and that he is following the Shepherd, oh! then let us adore the love and goodness of the Shepherd, and rejoice that after all they are real sheep and not goats, and hence are not to be attacked with stones and staves, and driven away from the gracious presence of the Shepherd, but are to be numbered among those who though not of our fold are yet of the other sheep who belong to the flock. Some one once asked Martin Luther in contemptuous pride, "Where was your Church before the Reformation?" And the quiet reply was, "Where was my face before it was washed?" Many a person whom in our ecclesiastical arrogance we might be tempted to look upon as an alien and outcast may have a cleaner face and appearance before God than ourselves. Whether you and I are to be

permitted to enjoy that unspeakable privilege of beholding the Church of Christ united or not, we can at least contribute this much towards that end. We can on our own part love Christ so supremely, and cherish such loyalty for the soul and essence of His religion, as to be able to say with the apostle of old: "Some indeed preach Christ even of envy and strife; and some also of good will: what then? notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence, or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice." We have got really to be real and great Christians to be able to feel in that mood, but St. Paul arrived there, and we may follow even though it be at a distance. Any man who loves the Lord Jesus Christ, him we should also love, whether he bows to the sway of Rome, or follows the teaching of Calvin or calls himself a disciple of that mighty man, the son of a black forest, charcoal burner—Martin Luther. The children of God, brothers in Christ, heirs of a common salvation are to be found even among the tiniest sects which like aphides crawl on the twigs and stems and leaves, or cling to the great branches of the Holy Vine; or to vary the figure, parasites, do we call them, wild creepers, thorns and thistles seeking to fasten themselves to the true vine or the real fig tree! Well, so be it. But if upon close scrutiny we find that the flower and fruit of this strange flora are not exotic, but spring from seed which comes alone from the Garden of God, then we are to be thankful that even in such unpromising and unlooked for places we have found the growth of a heavenly planting. Let us not begrudge the grace and love and goodness which God bestows upon the *other sheep*. And some day we may discover that we as well as they did not know everything; and our surprise may be mutual at the revelation of a more profound and comprehensive principle of unity than anything of which in our highest moments we had ever dreamed. Our differences of form may then

be shown to have resulted from the circumstances amid which we live rather than to the spirit in which we live; and our separations may have subserved the purposes of God, and accomplished a work in perfect harmony with the plans determined in the councils of eternity, which by reason of finite limitations we could not understand, and would never have imagined had not eternity disclosed them. Yet, for myself I dare believe that God will not postpone such a revelation to the eternity of the future. Already there are signs of the coming in of a new and brighter day, in the fortunes of the Christian Church. Just as the moon sways the tides and the hound bays at it in vain, so will this movement which is now going on in the Churches accomplish the fulness and oneness of its purpose, if it be of God as I doubt not it is. Man may hinder the movement and throw obstacles in our path, and cause us to wade through sloughs of despond and climb hills of difficulty, and fight for victory against many a fierce dragon of despair;

"But that city's shining spires
We travel to,"

break upon our vision, and we will not faint nor fail until we have done everything in our power to bring all who profess and call themselves Christians into the way of truth, and to hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace and in righteousness of life. God speed the day!

G. H. KINSOLVING.

Bishop's House,
Austin, Texas.

THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER AT GENEVA AND THE QUESTION OF THE UNION OF THE CHURCHES

(Translated from the Greek by Ralph W. Brown and abridged by the editor.)

To His Beatitude Photios, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria, and to the Holy Synod of the Apostolic and Patriarchal Throne of Alexandria. Memorial from Nikolaos Evangelides, Metropolitan of Nubia.

Your Beatitude:

The official report of what took place at the World Conference on Faith and Order in Geneva has been submitted to your Beatitude and to the Holy Synod of the Church of Alexandria by the Committee which represented the Patriarchate of Alexandria in that Conference, and the purpose of the present communication is to express my individual ideas, by way of supplement, on the same subject and on the question of the union of the Churches.

Every reverent Christian heart in which there dwells the Holy Spirit and the love of the divine Saviour, is deeply grieved by the lamentable division and cutting-up of the Church and the rending of the garment of Christ, considering this division closely connected with the grievous condition of the world, the strifes and conflicts, the wars and disorders, the mutual hatred and fanaticism, the sufferings and predominance of sin in the world, which weaken the work of Christ (the salvation of the faithful, for whom He died), and delay the accomplishment of His work, which is the evangelization and salvation of those who dwell in darkness and in the shadow of death; and the name of the Lord is blasphemed in the nations, as the Prophet foretold.

Indeed, one feels one's heart burned by the desire for the union of all Christendom, when one considers how

many and what sort of good things would result from that work, pleasing to God—spiritual, moral and material benefits, in a word, the complete reconstruction of the world.

If religious and moral unity in Christ prevailed in the world, if there were one and the same panchristian conscience, source of solidarity and mutual love, an irenic spirit would be developed and strengthened among the peoples, and there would be assured a lasting and world-wide peace incomparably better than by political covenants and armed alliances. Racial considerations, which separate the peoples like Chinese walls, would lose their power, and every citizen would regard his neighbor, of the same nation or of another nation, with love, as an equal and a brother, created by the all-good Father. He would respect the rights and the freedom of the other, and would consider every transgression of those principles as irreverence, fratricide and rebellion against God. The Christian would believe firmly that wars which people vainly try to justify as in defense of the right and as a necessary evil, are a fault, a moral derailment, a failure of love and respect of the rights of one's neighbor, a distortion of the spirit of Christianity, a deadly sin against civilization and humanity; and he would require the leaders of the peoples to settle the differences and frictions which might arise between the nations with scrupulous justice and in a Christian way, by peaceful means.

The Church, one and undivided, would come again into its ancient orbit, and would assemble in Ecumenical Councils, in which the Holy Spirit would speak again in public, as at the first Pentecost, and decisions and measures of general interest would be taken, which the Church would have full power and might to make respected and effective.

Then materialism and disbelief, religious coldness and

indifference, the increasing laxity of morals and dissoluteness, alcoholism and evils, communistic and ungodly systems under many names, would be completely overcome, and serious general measures would be taken for the moral restoration of sick humanity. The diverse measures and half-measures of the Churches and states, which now encounter so much systematic opposition from mischief-working forces which hate the good, would be multiplied and strengthened, and the peoples whose means to this end are scanty would procure aid from the abundance of those who are more powerful, in behalf of the common effort, which is the establishment and predominance of the Kingdom of God throughout the whole world.

By means of the union of all, under our Saviour's law of love, beneficence and philanthropic activity would increase and the unavoidable wounds of humanity would be healed more speedily by Christian wine and oil.

In short, the most important mission of the visible Church on earth, which is, in addition to the sanctification of the faithful, to spread the divine light of the Gospel to the peoples that still sit in darkness and in the shadow of death (Luke 1:79), will be accomplished more easily and speedily. The calling of the nations among whom the true faith is not yet spread, delayed by the mutual opposition of the missionaries, which sounds badly to those who do not know the facts, and which provokes distrust, would be forwarded by the blessings of the Chief Shepherd, Christ, and the Church, as a mighty divine work, full of grace and truth, would increase daily, and would grow into a holy temple in the Lord, a habitation of God in the Spirit (Eph. 2:21, 22).

Led by these good intentions and hopes, the Orthodox Churches of the East hastened to be represented in the aforesaid Panchristian Conference by an adequate number of delegates, thus manifesting, besides their readi-

ness, the significance which the Eastern Church as a whole attaches to the movement for the union of the Churches. The other Churches and religious bodies, too, were represented by competent and distinguished members of the hierarchy and learned theologians. Thus there assembled 120 delegates of 80 Churches and religious bodies, coming from 40 countries, so that it can truly be said that the Conference in question is the most important gathering and attempt for mutual acquaintance, rapprochement and eventual union of the different Churches since the lamented schism of the ninth century.

The Conference met in the great hall, "Athenee," sitting morning and afternoon for eight days. The sessions opened and closed with silent prayer, the reading of a passage of the Holy Gospel relative to the matter in hand, and the recitation together of the Lord's Prayer each in his own language. The Orthodox and Old Catholic delegates occupied the first row of benches. It was an impressive, imposing and stirring sight, symbolizing the longed-for union of the Churches, peoples, races and tongues, led by the Holy Spirit to the unity of faith in the bond of peace. The subjects for discussion were laid down by the Rt. Rev. President Brent as follows: (1) the Church and the nature of the united Church; (2) the Holy Scriptures; and (3) the Creed in relation to union. On the questions submitted for discussion, there were heard thoroughly orthodox opinions on the part of eminent higher clergy and theologians of world-wide renown, but very various opinions were also expressed, conflicting with one another and differing entirely from the Orthodox faith. Of the former, we mention the Old Catholic conception, expressed by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Herzog of Switzerland, whose vigorous and venerable old age, piety and religious fervor, evoked general respect and honor, and by the Rt. Rev. Bishop of Haarlem, Holland. These men expressed very Orthodox convic-

tions, basing them on Holy Scripture, genuine sacred tradition and the decisions of the seven Ecumenical Synods. Likewise great breadth of judgment and true understanding in many respects were shown in the speeches by Anglican and American Bishops, for instance, the Rt. Rev. Bishop Gore, formerly of Oxford, and Bishop Palmer of Bombay, who declared definitely against the federative union of the Churches according to the Protestant method, because such a union, being loose and for the most part external, is not adequate, since it includes a certain degree of diversity, and does not come up to the New Testament ideal. They likewise expressed themselves in behalf of the need of a creed in the Church, and spoke expressly in favor of the Nicene Creed.

But while the aforesaid declarations filled us with joy in the Lord and with Christian rejoicing, there followed thick and fast statements of faith of various other bodies and systems. Besides the well-known Calvinists or Presbyterians and Lutherans, we have the Congregationalists of America and England, the English Society of Friends or Quakers, the Methodists, the Baptists and Disciples of Christ, to mention only a few of these religious systems. They differ radically from the Orthodox Church in the aforesaid subjects of the faith. For they teach other things with regard to the nature of the Church, and they do not consider sacred tradition necessary, and they do not recognize holy orders as a special grace in the Church, or they reject the grade of bishop and all the sacraments. They do not recognize the need for a creed in the Church. From that, one can understand what a gulf is fixed between the Orthodox Church and the aforesaid systems which ignore the historical development of Christianity and the teaching of the ancient Church, and are based one-sidedly on Holy Scripture alone.

The Orthodox delegation expounded the true nature of the Church, the inward unity of the Orthodox Church in faith and worship, and its outward unity in administration, the historical development of the Christian faith and the fixation of its present type by the ancient Councils in creeds, canons and laws, whose observance is an indispensable dogma of the faith for every devout Christian. They pointed out that the previous speakers had passed one-sided judgments upon the various questions of faith, taking only Holy Scripture as their basis, whereas the Word of God was consigned to the Church, in writing and orally; that they had forgotten that Christianity itself is the supreme historical fact, so that, in explaining the various questions of faith and of the Gospel, the voice of history and sacred Church tradition as an infallible criterion must also be taken into consideration; that is to say, that since the time of Origen, grammatical and historical interpretation is fixed and established; and finally, that without the creed, and indeed the historical Nicene Creed, which replaced the ancient baptismal formulas, unity in the Church cannot be conceived. Finally it was declared that the unity which is desired and sought after must be complete dogmatic and moral unity.

So much by way of summary of what occurred at the preparatory Conference in Geneva. I think it fitting, in what follows, to express my own humble opinion on the interesting question of the union of the Churches, as a very slight aid to the wise and experienced minds of your Beatitude and the Hierarchy of the Alexandrine Throne.

(A) *Is union possible and attainable?*

That the different Churches and the entire world will be united some day in one religious family, one Church and one flock, permits of no doubt, since this is Christ's will, which our Lord Jesus Christ, the divine Founder of the Church, declared prophetically. This idea is the

ardent desire of all devout minds and teachers of the Church, and best serves the interest of right-thinking, religiously-inclined humanity, and is a question of its very life and existence. Whatever may be the opposition of impiety, selfishness, racial enmity and biassed interests, it is impossible that in the end, the divine will *that all may be one* will not prevail and find fulfilment. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but Christ's words shall not pass away (Matt. 24:35) until they are fulfilled to the last iota and until there is one flock and one Shepherd.

(B) *Of what sort should the union of the Churches be?*

Should there be full and complete predominance of one and the same confession of faith, the same dogmas, the same worship and administration, or acceptance of only certain points, the principal ones, of the faith, but freedom concerning the points of disagreement? Or should there be complete indifference for the present and entire freedom with regard to dogma, worship and administration, and only moral union in Christ's law of love? From this it is plain that there are three different conceptions and methods of union, viz., (a) complete dogmatic union; (b) partial dogmatic union; and (c) moral union. We proceed to examine these three standpoints:

(a) *Complete dogmatic union.*

Those who took the initiative in calling together the Panchristian Conference in Geneva, moved by good will and evangelical zeal, having studied things diligently and possessing great experience, with history as their teacher and guide, declare in a pamphlet which they previously published that the differences between the confessions are very great, but they believe that it is possible for them to be simplified in time by mutual explanation of the reasons for the various opinions, and by bringing the Churches into contact with one another. However, they pronounce against the method of religious

debates and polemics, which embitters minds and has led to isolation and to petrified hatred, and to the cutting-up of Christianity. In other words, they consider that dogmatic and sacramental unity is for the present, if not entirely impossible, certainly very difficult. They extol, as possible and salutary, the moral union of the Churches in Christ's law of love, which brings about the union of souls, because Christianity is a religion of love and life. Peace, righteousness and justice of all nations and all men must be founded on Christ's law of love. These beautiful words about love in Christ and the bond of the world in love, were repeated by various speakers at the Conference.

The supporters of this plan are inspired, as we have said, by history, according to which dogmatic debates have repeatedly come to no result and have in part increased the evils of fanaticism and racial prejudice, multiplying heresies and schisms and weakening the working of Christ's love. And since the various Churches still hold firmly to their own opinions, each remaining immovable in its own, which have been deeply rooted by the action of many centuries, and since the Churches are convinced that they crystallize the pure spirit of the religion of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Committee which published the pamphlet and took the initiative felt that for the present there is no other meeting place for the different Churches and religious systems except the ethical side, and in fact, the method of love. As is immediately plain from this scheme of union in Christ's law of love, which is extolled in the Gospel by the disciple of love and identified with God Himself, and by the apostle to the nations lyrically as mightier than all faith, mightier than the knowledge of all the mysteries, than power to work wonders and to prophesy and speak languages, and above any sacrifice and even life itself—in this scheme of union, in which the chief object seems to

be to keep away from the reefs of dogmatic debate, the value of the true faith is degraded, being characterized as a secondary matter and of minor importance for the union and salvation of the world, whereas in Holy Scripture, faith has the same value and power as love. Likewise, for the sake of the moral union of the Churches, the colossal labor and the long and bloody struggles of the ancient Church for the right interpretation and dissemination of the lofty truths of the Gospel and for the prevalence of the true faith, are characterized as almost useless, scientifically and practically, and as causes of harm, causes of divisions.

Christ by the Apostle Paul foretells the entrance into the Church of grievous wolves (Acts 20:29) to its confusion and the perversion of His doctrine, and He made the teachers of the Church responsible for watching over themselves and the whole flock, of which the Holy Spirit has made them overseers (bishops) to shepherd the Church of Christ. Again, by the same apostle, He pronounces a curse upon those who try to pervert Christ's Gospel and to preach something other than what they had received and were taught (Gal. 1:7). Thus the responsibility for the divisions does not weigh upon the innocent, the champions of the truth, those who held to the ancient traditions and truths of their fathers, but upon those who introduced new fancies. Of what great service the complete fixation of dogma in our Church has been, is clear from the variously-named heresies, impossible to count, which have arisen in late years in the Protestant Churches, precisely on account of the lack of dogmatic and administrative coherence and unity of their members.

For these reasons the Eastern Orthodox Church, having its faith already fixed by divinely inspired Synods and ratified by so many centuries, cannot deviate from

the ancient basis, as was clearly stated in the memorial submitted to the Geneva meeting.

The holy Nicene Creed and the dogmatic decrees of the seven great Ecumenical Synods form a divine basis, infallible and of indisputable validity. By those Synods the Church of Christ, then one and united, spoke the final word on the questions of faith. Any change of those doctrines constitutes, not progress and completion, but perversion of the substance of the faith, pernicious and perilous innovation. In the Ecumenical Synods the truth of the faith was interpreted rightly and crystallized definitively, after long investigations and discussions by the Church, on the basis of Holy Scripture and the genuine ancient and catholic tradition. If on those foundations and from that standpoint the union of the Churches were attempted, there is much hope and probability of success. But the objection is advanced that such a dogmatic union as this has been attempted more than once with the Roman Church and the Protestant Churches and has failed. If we attentively examine the various attempts at union, we shall acknowledge that the great differences as to dogma are not the only cause of the failure of the measures taken toward agreement. With reference to the Roman Church, the negotiations with it have failed both because of the innovations of the Popes in matters of the faith, and also because the efforts which were made had their origin in political necessity and in the designs of the Byzantine Empire upon the Church, and not in purely ecclesiastical initiative and desire for union.

As concerns the unsuccessful efforts with the Protestants and Anglicans, we can distinguish internal and external causes. Internal causes are the material differences in faith and administration; for the Protestants, in fleeing from the papal yoke, from the transgressions and innovations of the Roman Church, got into the opposite

extremity. Rejecting even true doctrines, and laying down as their basis liberty and uncontrolled scrutiny of the Scriptures, they opened the way for many aberrations. The Anglican Churches are an exception, relatively speaking, being more conservative and closer to the ancient Church.

As a final reason for the failure of the negotiations for union, we add the following: The Christian world of East and West, enslaved during the Middle Ages by the domination of religious and racial fanaticism and many prejudices, disturbed very often by internal convulsions and by wars with the outside, never rose to the plane of seeing things impartially from the single standpoint of love and the general interest. For those reasons, the failures do not indicate the impossibility of union in the future, nor must they inspire pessimism and disillusionment. On the contrary they must teach the avoidance of the mistakes that have occurred and the use of means of greater promise, with zeal, good will and systematic effort, until we all attain unto the unity of the faith (Eph. 4:13), the ancient, genuine, apostolic and truly catholic faith. That is the first and only possible way of true union of the Churches—complete dogmatic union.

(b) *Partial dogmatic union.*

Another way leading to a sort of unity of the Churches is the following: Let dogmatic agreement and union be declared by common acceptance of the principal points of faith, on which the opinions of the Churches coincide, the other points of disagreement being characterized as theological opinions, with perfect freedom to accept them or not. This way was followed in the discussions of the delegates of the various Churches at the attempts for union with the Old Catholics, which occurred in various cities, particularly at Bonn (1874-1875). But that method encountered much opposition in Greece and England. I shall not spend time on that method, because it

reveals itself at once as not assuring a firm and promising union of the Churches, but one that is imperfect and loose, not curing the division and the existing disagreements, and not answering to the spirit of the Gospel and to the type of the ancient Church. Complete dogmatic union of the Churches remains the only right and effective kind.

(c) *Moral union.*

Since complete dogmatic union on the basis of the ancient status of the faith appears to most people very difficult and unattainable, because of the freedom of thought and conception which prevails in our time even in religious questions, there remains and there is proposed another note of union, the moral side of the Gospel doctrine, viz., love of Christ, which is a truth accepted by all, complete freedom being left for the present as to belief, the doctrines of each Church being proclaimed worthy of respect.

That plan of the union of all Christians in the law of Christ's love, regardless of faith, worship and administration, appears at first, as we have already mentioned, practical, and seems a beautiful, felicitous idea, with many strong reasons in its favor, and able to lead without difficulties and struggles to some result. Let us see, then, whether on this moral footing alone the desired union of the Churches is possible, practicable and advantageous from a religious standpoint.

First it must be observed that this method leads to an imperfect and partial unity, and is a repetition of the method just preceding, with the difference that the ground of agreement is transferred from dogma to ethics, the ethics commonly accepted. I have characterized that plan as initially practical and felicitous, because when it is accepted as a basis of the union of the Churches, all the Churches and religious bodies, even the most extreme and liberal as to the faith, will coincide. The rationalists

with the ultramontane conservatives, the religious indifferents and those who believe to suit themselves, will enroll as members of that world-wide society.

But such union is moral and not religious union, a world-wide moral, not a Christian, league. For how could a follower of the true Church identify his convictions and religious ideals and expectations of future life —one who believes in Jesus Christ as God and in the mystery of the Incarnation—with the ideas of the rationalist and the religious indifferent who denies the truths of revelation? According to the former, the ethics of the Gospel are the will and law of God, revealed by the Son, of one substance with the Father, and have divine and perpetual validity. According to the latter, the Gospel ethics differ in no way from the philosophical ethics of Plato and Aristotle except in so far as the Gospel conception of it is loftier and more perfect, and according to natural reason some other moral teacher could perhaps in future draw up an ethical system more perfect and better adapted to the conditions of the times and the nature of man. For ethics based on human logic is changeable according to the way of thinking and living of the most developed minds.

But ethics, deprived of a divine basis and divine authority, has no sure foundations and no absolute validity, but affords a ground for debates and doubts. Upon such an ethics, instable and not indissolubly bound up with religion, it is impossible that humanity should be consolidated and advanced. That was tried at the time of the great French Revolution, when religion had been abolished by law. The attempt was then made to establish morality on the basis of philosophy, and moral and philosophical precepts were proclaimed as laws of the republic, inscribed on tablets in the public squares and streets for the instruction of the people. The consequence was the moral derailment of man to such a degree

that the guillotine could not keep up with its frightful task, so that the leaders of the revolution themselves, and those who had established atheism by legislation, were compelled to restore by law the faith in God, and to establish in religion the moral duties of man. Certainly we have gone far afield in these reflections, and have brought unusual conditions under consideration (complete abandonment of the spirit of religion, or at least the loosest sort of bond between religion and morals), but we wished by that means to call to mind whither a one-sided moral union can lead; for it is well known that rationalism abolishes the religion of the Crucified and lays down a foundation other than that proclaimed by the Apostle Paul, on which the Church of Christ is established.

On the other hand, moral unity in Christ's law of love already exists, without any formal declaration, among all those who believe in any way in Christ and accept the holy Gospel. Such moral unity can in time be advanced by good training, by improvement of the moral faculties, by education, by the wider application of the moral principles of the Gospel, by franker intercourse of the Churches. But it must be called moral unity and not Christian or religious unity. A Christian, according to the mind of the Church and of religion, has the name of a believer in Christ, and does believe in Christ as by nature the Son of God, and acknowledges Him as leader of his religious and moral life. A man is not a Christian who acts according to the law of the Gospel but who does not believe in the law-giver and in God, for the doctrine and work of Christ is indissolubly bound up with His Person. For that reason, those who initiated the World Conference at Geneva very rightly laid down as the basis and condition of the invitation, the confession of faith in Christ Jesus, Who came in flesh.

The Eastern Orthodox Church holds love in Christ

very high, as the source of true life, as the firm foundation of peace and righteousness, as an indispensable condition of spiritual salvation and of the union of the Churches, and therefore tries to be at peace, if possible, with all men, and to live the life of love in Christ, teaching her own children that God is love. But she is never indifferent to the true faith, which she considers likewise an indispensable element of salvation. Faith and works of love are the two foundations on which, according to the Gospel, the present happiness and future salvation of man is assured. Our Lord in receiving those who came to Him by faith and baptism, with all wisdom joined faith with good works, dogma with morality, in His teaching, and made salvation depend upon faith working through love.

The love of Christ is surely an all-powerful bond, which nothing is able to dissolve, not affliction, want, persecution, famine, danger, the sword; but it cannot develop save in hearts which are truly religious and which lean upon the arm of faith. To declare the union of the Churches upon the moral basis only, is itself incomplete, one-sided and unfruitful, and would moreover give grounds for many dangerous misconceptions. The people, not clearly understanding things, on seeing the Church concentrating its attention upon the practical side of love, would interpret this as a relegation of (the) faith to a lesser plane of worth, and one of two things would happen:—either free thinking and the optional acceptance of the dogmatic truths of religion would be introduced, and so we should fall into rationalism; or else the panorthodox conscience would not accept this moral unity and would rise up and bring it to naught. For those reasons, dogmatic and moral union remains the only right, firm, fruitful kind in accordance with the Gospel, and any other one-sided, semi-union is unstable and harmful.

(C) *What is the suitable time for union of the Churches?*

The Lord in His authority has appointed the times and seasons; but to judge things in a human way, we believe that the present time is very favorable and matters are very pressing. For the people are more developed spiritually and are less prejudiced and fanatical, though they still remain under the influence of racial antipathies. The clergy has a broader conception of its functions. The Churches are more enfranchised from the State and less subject to ingenious manipulation from without. The awful conflict of the peoples, which, alas, is by no means ended, has brought about a general upheaval on the spiritual, moral and social horizon, and demands radical measures to conserve the ruins and to check the harm. The varied moral and material wounds of humanity, revealed by the flash of the cannon in the savage heat of war; the plastic and superficial character of European civilization of the present day, which hides poison beneath a cordial smile, and a fratricidal dagger under a gloved hand—these things have thrust into the foreground the unmistakable and pressing need for measures to remedy the evil. The politicians and military men resort once more to the methods, so often tried, of political treaties and armed alliances to impose peace in the world. The socialists, communists and anti-militarists want to do away with law and with military service in time of war and with violent uprisings. But the radical and lawful means, the one and only salutary remedy, is the coalition of the Churches everywhere under the empire of the love of Christ, to fight in a holy alliance, unbreakable and invincible, against sin, which in varied forms, like a many-headed hydra, is destroying humanity by fire and sword, materialism and unbelief, falsehood and superstition, fanaticism and religious enmity, corruption of morals

and alcoholism, bolshevism and anarchy and other socialistic systems.

However, in judging the present moment suitable for beginning to press our efforts for union, we are not of the opinion that the goal is near, for it is not possible to bridge quickly chasms which have been lying open and widening for so many centuries. We believe that the road to the desired goal is long and arduous, narrow and straitened (Matt. 7:14), but we must arm ourselves with patience and courage for the sake of Christ's love, for the sake of the peace and salvation of the world, and for our own sake.

(D) *Of what sort are the measures in preparation for union?*

Since dogmatic discussions would lead again to-day to the same result of disagreement, the Orthodox delegation at the Conference advocated in its memorial certain practical measures which, if put sincerely and impartially into practice, would contribute to the removal of many existing misunderstandings among the Churches and of many impediments, and to gradual acquaintance, study, rapprochement, confidence and solidarity, which in time would greatly smooth the way toward the dogmatic union of the Churches.

(1) Formation of a permanent committee of the Churches under the title *League of the Churches,* after the model of the League of Nations. This committee would have no executive authority, but would serve as an outward moral bond of union of the Churches. It would follow every ecclesiastical movement in the world, and would appear before the governments of the Powers as counsel for the general interests of the Churches. It would promote mutual explanations by the Churches on various questions, which would be discussed in its special periodical organ, as from a supreme pulpit of the Churches, and many dogmatic and ecclesiastical differ-

ences would be settled. In this League, the Eastern Orthodox Church, with its ancient prestige, its commonly recognized orthodoxy, would exercise an active influence upon the newer Churches, making itself more widely known, and in time impressing its orthodoxy upon the other Churches. This central League would have the power and the means to forestall many transgressions by certain Churches to the injury of others, resulting from fanaticism and a spirit of domination, and in general it could prove itself a most useful factor for the Churches and the peoples.

(2) Exertion of every effort by the great Churches to unite the small religious units, so as to limit the number of the disagreeing sections, and to have instead of many Churches and systems, fewer but larger groups. Such a task has already commenced, according to the statements of the Anglicans, who are making serious efforts for union with the related religious off-shoots, such as the Congregationalists, Baptists, etc. It is right that similar efforts should be exerted on the part of the Orthodox Church among the neighboring Monophysite Churches of the East.

(3) Cessation of proselytism among Christians. Just as to call the nations which know not the Gospel to the light and the truth is a duty and a praiseworthy procedure for every Church, a continuation of the work of the apostles, the enlightenment of minds and the salvation of souls, so to detach Christians from the Church in which they were born is for the most part a work of seduction and an offense to conscience. The ill-intentioned proselytizing zeal of certain Churches and religious bodies of Europe and America has come from an erroneous conception of the religious and moral condition of the peoples of the East. While it produces the very fewest of strange fruits, it gives rise to many scandals, domestic, social and national, awakens the distrust

of the Churches of the East toward the other Churches, nurtures fanaticism and religious hatred, and widens the chasm which separates the Churches.

(4) Development of Christian solidarity among Christians, to improve the lot of peoples, particularly in the East. The peoples of the East, who for centuries past have been consumed by fire and sword at the hands of infidels, to whom they are in political servitude, must encounter a more Christian treatment on the part of the mighty ones of the earth. The Churches must show themselves more sympathetic and sensitive toward the sufferings of Christians of no matter what Church and nationality, in order that the spirit of love and union may be thus cultivated. Hitherto the Churches in Europe and America, which hold the practical spirit of Christianity in high esteem have not been stirred by the slaughters and destruction by the Turks of hundreds of thousands of Christians—Armenian, Greek and Syrian—and except for weak protests in England and America, no measure of consequence has been adopted. Greater interest and solidarity is thus imperative to develop the spirit of love and mutual confidence, which would greatly further the work of the union of the Churches.

General Conclusions

As was emphasized in our official report, and as is clear from what precedes, the Conference, as a preparatory meeting achieved its purpose. (1) The Churches, for the first time after so many centuries, interchanged opinions through official representatives and conferred together in a spirit of benignity and concord. (2) Through what developed in the Conference, the Churches became acquainted with each other's views and dispositions so as to orientate themselves for the future in their efforts to develop closer relations and rapprochement. (3) The foundations were laid for more conclusive work.

(4) From an Orthodox standpoint, the unseemly method of proselytism among Christians was condemned from an official panchristian platform; a voice was raised, and the need for developing Christian solidarity among the Churches was unanimously accepted. (5) Occasion was afforded to the Eastern Orthodox Church to acquaint the others with its ancient prestige and apostolic type in faith, worship and administration, and to remove so many misconceptions and erroneous opinions about itself on the part of the other Churches, due to ignorance of the facts or to slander by evil-intentioned enemies of our Church. (6) The sympathy of the Conference was expressed for the terrible sufferings of Christians in the East and in Russia, and its approval of the formation of the League of Nations as an institution contributory to the establishment of lasting peace in the world.

So much as to the results of the Conference. Since, as we have said, the Conference entrusted the continuation of its labors to a committee of over forty members, and since those who took the laudable initiative of the Conference will very probably continue with the same zeal their efforts for the work of the union of the Churches, the Eastern Orthodox Church must indicate its position and course in the matter. On that particular point permit me to submit my humble opinion, shaped by the labors of the Conference, by private interviews with representatives of other Churches and by my own studies.

The Protestant Churches are convinced that the completely decentralized system which prevails among them, with full liberty for each body to decide its own faith and administration and to change them at will, and the lack of all administrative coherence, have led to the enfeeblement and cutting-up of the Protestant Church and to deep decomposition. They have therefore recognized the need, and have started a strong movement, for closer religious and administrative union with one another.

Likewise the Episcopal Church in England and America are working hard for closer union with each other, and to combine with their smaller off-shoots, the Congregationalists, Methodists, Quakers and others.

As concerns complete accord and dogmatic union with the Lutherans, Baptists, Methodists, Congregationalists, Quakers and others of their kin, there can be no serious question, for they differ on very essential and fundamental dogmas and sacraments. Likewise all efforts must be characterized as labor lost for union with the reformed Lutheran Churches in Germany, Switzerland and France, which have gone much further away from the ancient faith, having fallen into rationalism and reduced the Christian religion to a system of ethics, denying the truths of revelation and miracles.

The situation is different in the case of the Episcopal and the Old Catholic Churches. With their representatives at Geneva the Orthodox delegation had more than one conference, unofficial but very enlightening, in which views were interchanged and explanations made on either side that could not be entered into in the complicated preparatory assembly.

The Conference with the Old Catholic representatives, at which the well-known Bishop Herzog presided, was warmer and heartier. To questions on the subject from the Old Catholic delegates, Bishop Herzog, began by explaining that the Old Catholics, having revolted against the innovations and transgressions of the Roman Church and particularly against the high-handed acts of the Pope, had rejected every newer papal invention, among them the *filioque* and the infallibility of the Pope, and had returned to the ancient state of affairs before the schism of the ninth century, and to the faith of the seven Ecumenical Synods. He burns with an intense desire, as do all his associates, for union of the two Churches.

Assuredly every work depends not on man's desires or

activities, but on God's mercy. But on the logical presupposition and the words of the Gospel that the work of union is pleasing to God and beneficial, it must find deep and continual solicitude on the part of the holy mother Church. Convinced that the existing division of the Churches is a terrible calamity for mankind because it has enfeebled the work of our Lord, diminished the moral influence of religion in the world, cultivated the germs of great evils and great calamities, we are in duty bound to work for the complete removal of this world-wide evil. But as we have said, such things are not accomplished briefly and by main strength, but gradually by prayer and unwearied effort, to the end that the world which has gone astray may be enlightened as to the truth and the true faith and the need for union, as the will of God, as a means of salvation and pacification of the world. Christ will dwell in us and will tarry among us when the scandals and divisions of the Churches cease, when one faith prevails, and the law of love, brotherhood and solidarity rules. Then the bleeding wounds of humanity will be healed and humanity will be fully restored to health, and the Church will take on its ancient prestige again and pursue its apostolic work, and the mind and heart of all who believe in Christ will be one. Amen.

+ Nikolaos Evangelides
(*Metropolitan*) *of Nubia.*

Geneva, September, 1920.

REUNION OF THE CHURCHES

I HAVE been asked to treat the subject of Church reunion from a more general point of view than that of our own Moravian negotations on this subject with the Anglican Church. I will endeavour to do so. But the Anglican position is bound to be referred to; not merely because it is uppermost in men's minds, but because it is the one practical effort at reunion which most clearly demonstrates our difficulties and which, on the other hand, if it could be accomplished, would be of the greatest importance for our national life.

When Churches are negotiating, it is important that they should have the same aim and the same spirit.

What are the Anglicans, the Free Churches, and ourselves hoping to get as the result of present negotiations? I have heard the word *reunion* used to describe the object aimed at. Hitherto I, and I think many others, have distinguished between *reunion* and other forms of closer fellowship. Under *reunion* I have understood *organic unity,* i.e., two or more Churches become one in organization. They may have several "departments," but they have one representative body, one final court of appeal, one government, one name (thus, e.g. three Methodist bodies reunited to form one "United Methodist Church"). It may be that the larger body absorbs the smaller ones; it may be that they interpenetrate one another fairly equally; at any rate, they are amalgamated, they *cease to be independent of one another.*

Anything less than that I have understood to be called *intercommunion.* In intercommunion the Churches *remain independent of one another;* they have separate names, separate representative bodies, separate governments. But they say to one another: we are friends, let us associate with one another. They may have united services, united communions, exchanges of pulpits; they

may arrange for conventions, conferences, alliances, federations. But they remain independent.

Now, I have been puzzled that the Anglicans use the word reunion and not intercommunion, and that Canon Mason declared emphatically that he was out for reunion, that intercommunion did not satisfy him; whilst the Free Churches and ourselves have used more frequently the word intercommunion to describe our aim. It looked as if there were diversity of aim. The communication from the Archbishop's Committee to our own committee makes it, however, plain that there is not diversity but identity of aim. They and we use different words, but they and we mean the same thing. When they speak of reunion they mean what we mean when we speak of intercommunion. Let me quote. They say "the Church of England has no desire to lower the status of the Moravian Church or to take away its autonomy." The Anglican bishops would not "seek to interfere in the internal affairs of the Moravian communities. Those communities would remain responsible to the Moravian bishops alone. Their manner of divine service, their discipline, their finance, their missionary activities would be independent of the diocesan" [i.e., of the Anglican bishop].

Nothing could be more explicit and reassuring. The Anglicans do not propose to absorb the Moravian Church or the Free Churches, but simply to have closer fellowship with us as independent Churches. It matters little whether it be called reunion or intercommunion. The same thing is meant. *There is unity of aim on all sides.*

I fear that to the question "Is there unity of the Spirit?" we cannot give so satisfactory an answer. I know there are people who seem to be impatient about the talk of unity of the Spirit. They say, "We are all agreed that there is unity of the Spirit, but we are tired of the perpetual hesitation of the Churches when it comes to any practical efforts to express that unity in real life." But

I believe that our real trouble is just that there is *not* unity of the Spirit. The case is just the opposite to the one discussed before. We found that whilst Anglicans and ourselves used different words, reunion and intercommunion, we meant the same thing; but now I fear we shall find that whilst we all use the same words, "unity of the Spirit," we mean different things.

All agree that any closer fellowship of the Churches must have at its basis a unity of the Spirit; but some think that this unity of the Spirit means *acceptance of certain agreed principles.*

Now the Spirit, which is the Spirit of Christ, is higher than any principles. Christ never tied Himself to any principle; He selected and handled principles as they might best serve His Spirit of Love. If you were to examine the life of Christ you would find Him acting on principles not only varying very much but often opposed to each other. He upheld the principle of tradition ("not one jot or tittle of the law shall pass away") and the principle of innovation ("it hath been said to them of old . . . but I say"); He commended the principle of authority ("all things that the scribes and Pharisees bid you do, these do and observe") and the principle of freedom from authority, when He bade men worship "neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem" but "in spirit and in truth"; He exalted the principle of economy when He had the fragments gathered up after the feeding of the multitude, but He gloried in the waste of more than three hundred pence worth of ointment; He established the principle of faith in the parable of the prodigal son and in His works of healing, but He bade us apply the principle of works when He said we were to judge by the fruits; He acted on the principle of caution when He taught in secret and bade men say nothing of His works, but on the principle of boldness when He went to challenge the people of Jerusalem; He commended

poverty to the rich young man, but would not listen to a request to ensure a just division of inheritance; He blessed the peacemakers, but said He had come to bring a sword!

Analyse Christ's life and you will find it a patchwork of principles, but a magnificent, a perfect unity because all those principles were at the service of the supreme and perfectly loving Spirit, which saw that in one case men were helped by applying one principle, in another case by applying another, but which above all always *saw to it that they were helped.* Christians have always gone wrong when they have taken a principle or a set of principles and have exalted them into the position of "essential principles" or "*the* essential principles" of Christianity. They have seized upon the principles of authority, of liberty, of sacerdotalism, of the universal priesthood of believers, of faith, of works, of poverty, of non-resistance, and many others. It has always meant that they made their Christianity narrower than Christ's.

If the movement towards reunion of the Churches is to be a blessing, it must surely be based on the Spirit of Christ. We can never unite on principles (nor, consequently, on practices which depend on principles). It seems to me that what is holding up the cause of the union is the search for such a basis, the search for agreed principles.

That is what troubles one in the Lambeth Appeal. What are the Anglican terms of union? Firstly, acceptance of the Holy Scriptures. This, happily, is not the acceptance of a principle but simply of an historical fact.* Secondly, the divinely instituted ordinances of Baptism and Holy Communion. There you have a principle implied, and you have narrowed your basis; the

*Suppose, for a moment, the condition had been: acceptance of Holy Scripture "interpreted on the lines of literal inspiration," or "interpreted on the lines of the historical-critical method," it will immediately be seen how the condition would have been narrowed, and that purely by the application of a principle.

Quakers and the Salvation Army are thereby excluded from a place in your reunited Church. Thirdly, the recognized order of ministry. There you are plunged right into the old controversy about episcopacy.

And if any one should say "these terms are not amiss as *broad statements* of principle," I would reply, "principles generally appear broad in statement, but in application are always just as narrow as the details, to which they are applied, are small." How narrow they can become is exemplified by the application thereof made by the Anglicans to the details of our own Church. What is amiss is that, being principles, they have lost the spaciousness of the Spirit of Christ.

On the other hand, the reply to the Lambeth Appeal issued by the Federal Council of the Free Churches troubles me, admirable and even beautiful as it is in many ways. When the writers feel it their duty to assert, "vital principles or postulates for which the Free Churches stand," which seem to them a "sacred trust," which they even appear to consider "not denominational but simply Christian," I am afraid. There is no "vital principle" for the Christian. There is a vital *Spirit,* a Spirit by which we live as Christians, by which alone we can claim the name of Christ, a Spirit which uses different principles according as it can help different people just as Christ did Himself.

The attempt to unite on principles is not unlike the discussion on marriage associated with the word "obey" in the marriage service. There are those who argue that there must be a head to every household for the sake of order, discipline, and peace, and therefore they decide that "in principle" the husband shall command, the wife obey. But every Christian knows that in a true marriage "each counts other better than himself," and the true head of the household is the Spirit of Love which does not settle on any principle of subordination, but some-

times bids the wife be subject to her husband, sometimes bids the husband be subject to his wife, a Spirit which tells both of them they need not trouble who obeys and who commands, because both will do both if they try to serve one another.

The Churches cannot unite on principles. If they did, they would be less than the Church of Christ. And if, in spite of that, they did, the Spirit would explode their work. You can no more tie down the Spirit of Christ to principles than you can dictate to nature what laws it shall follow. The Spirit of Christ is great with the greatness of nature, surpassing our efforts to classify, to codify, to rectify, and even to clarify. It is sovereign. All we can do is to *recognize* that so it is, so it acts.

I do not know *why* it is that there are people who are so much helped by the principle of episcopacy or the idea of apostolic succession. I only know that it *is* so, that the Spirit has used this principle to help men. I can only bow before the facts and recognize them. I do not know *why* it is that other people are more helped by the principle of freedom. It *is* so; the Spirit uses this principle. I must recognize the fact.

Why cannot the Churches simply recognize one another as *facts of the Spirit?* There is no need to prove to one another the essentiality of our principles. There is no call to ask one another to sacrifice cherished principles or to accept unwelcome principles. No one is helped thereby. We have but to recognize the facts of the Spirit. Look at the "Appeal" of the bishops issued from Lambeth to the Christian world. It is to use a very touching document—so entrancing a vision uttered in so beautiful words; so fine an inspiration to seek out and follow up in a great adventure of good will and faith "the creative resources of God." Then, suddenly, a collapse! How are the mighty fallen! Instead of a moving picture of "the creative resources of God," instead of a

Psalmist's praise, "O Lord, how manifold are Thy works, in wisdom hast Thou made them all," there comes an inconsequential suggestion: let *us create* thus and thus; and forthwith an unlovely piece of ecclesiastical scaffolding is reared before our eyes.

No. We do not create. We can only recognize what the Spirit creates. Recognition is the keyword: mutual recognition among the Churches and cordial recognition, not because they have converted one another to any set of principles, but because the Spirit of Christ is amongst them and the Spirit is supreme.

C. H. Shawe.

Moravian Church,
Swindon, England.

THE NEW WORLD

In temporary pain
The age is bearing a new breed
Of men and women, patriots of the world
And one another. Boundaries in vain,
Birthrights and countries, would constrain
The old diversity of seed
To be diversity of soul.
  O mighty patriots, maintain
Your loyalty!—till flags unfurled
For battle shall arraign
The traitors who unfurled them, shall remain
And shine over an army with no slain,
And men from every nation shall enroll
And women—in the hardihood of peace!
  What can my anger do but cease?
Whom shall I fight and who shall be my enemy
When he is I and I am he?

—*Witter Bynner.*

THE LOST IDEAL

The Communion Table, as Observed by the Primitive Christians, a Basis for Church Unity

The religious moratorium in Europe and denominational unrest in America, which are features in the wreckage of the world war, must be dealt with as a condition precedent to the proper reconstruction of the social order. In this supreme ordeal the living elements in the faith of each division of the Church, that is, the spiritual values of the beliefs of the several denominations, must function to the practical neglect of the volume of sacerdotal practices that do not matter so much.

As a distinct result of intimate personal contact incident to the war, schemes of unity among the Churches are widely welcomed. The pinions of many denominations, long uncordial if not hostile, are now beating perceptibly toward one another in an atmosphpere of amity. The vital religious experiences affecting communities and nations spring from the common level; organization into a movement is the last and not the first step. Note this layman declaration of Englishmen:

> It has become clear to-day, both through the arbitrament of war and through the tests of rebuilding of a life of peace, that neither education, science, diplomacy nor commercial prosperity, when allied with a belief in material force as the ultimate power, are real foundations for the ordered development of the world's life. The spirit of good will among men rests on spiritual forces; the hope of a brotherhood of humanity reposes on the deeper spiritual fact of the fatherhood of God. In the recognition of the fact of that fatherhood and of the divine purpose for the world, which are central to the message of Christianity, we shall discover the ultimate foundation for the reconstruction of an ordered and harmonious life for all men.

This message was addressed "to our fellow citizens of the British Empire," and was signed by Premier Lloyd George of the United Kingdom, Premier Robert Borden of Canada, Premier W. M. Hughes of Australia, Premier Massey of New Zealand and Premier Squires of New Foundland.

We are told that in a French city, where American soldiers were quartered, there was a service in a Huguenot Church, conducted by a Methodist clergyman, assisted by four other ministers, a Lutheran, a Baptist, an Episcopalian and another Methodist, all in Y. M. C. A. uniform. The communion was often partaken by the soldiers, the invitations being offered without any condition, except a desire to honor Christ and seek His help. "We have no time for denominational distinctions in this war," was the remark of one officiating minister.

The writer at this point waives, but does not ignore, the nature of the interference of many learned and pious people stationed in the pathway of Church unity. The protests are many and vigorous. The movement, they maintain, advocates an ethical rather than a sacrificial Christ; it preaches the teachings of Christ and not the atoning blood of Christ; it strikes the trail of Keshab Chundar Sen, the Hindu theist, during his English tour of 1870, when he addressed the various sects,—"Think you that I have no Christ within me? Though I am Indian,—I can still humbly say—Thank God, I have my Christ"; it is not morally esthetic; it has nothing to say about the joys of heaven and the woes of hell—and so on.

These dogmas will keep, even if the movement toward Church unity does prosper. It does not menace the integrity of any denomination on the lines of its particular faith and practices. Predilections as to Church government and biblical interpretation are often determined by temperamental or social casts of character. Structural unity of the Churches is not essential to an evangelical

unity in the work of carrying the comfort of the oracles of Christ to every hearthstone. Let the Episcopalian cling to his ritual, the Baptist to his immersion and the Calvinist to his hell. By these are they edified. The Sermon on the Mount remains—the most perfect code for human action revealed to men. The heart of the world is sore and its mind spiritually distracted. No fatality of impotence can keep the Church from carrying the words of Christ to the peoples of the earth.

The process leading up to a concert of the Churches must be direct and elemental. The common table of the primitive Christians, who interpreted the words of the Lord, is as vital to-day as in apostolic times; but the ideal of a communion of believers is lost in an overgrowth of theological speculation. It is profitable, therefore, to follow down the story of the Eucharist as an historical development.

The communion of the primitive Christians was a Sunday meal partaken as a memorial of their spiritual teacher who had revealed their relationship to God, the Father. The earliest ritual used at the communion supper, which, as we know was a veritable meal as well as spiritual food and drink, has come down to us in the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," a copy of which was discovered in Constantinople in 1873, and which is supposed by Christian scholars to be second-century testimony. Quotations from it nearly back to the day of the first Christians are numerous enough in Christian literature to have enabled one to arrange consistently the bulk of the "teaching" ages before the Constantinople discovery. The communion ritual in the "Teaching" runs as follows:

> Now concerning the Eucharist, thus give thanks:
> "We thank Thee, our Father, for the holy vine of David, Thy servant; to Thee be the glory forever."

And concerning the broken bread:

"We thank Thee, our Father, for the life and knowledge which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus, Thy servant; to Thee be the glory forever. Just as this broken bread was scattered over the hills and having become gathered became one, so let Thy Church be gathered from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom; for Thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever."

But, let no one eat or drink of your Eucharist except those baptized in the name of the Lord; for in regard to this the Lord hath said:
"Give not that which is holy to the dogs." Now after ye are filled, thus do ye give thanks:
"We thank Thee, our Father, for Thy holy name, which Thou hast caused to dwell in our hearts, and for the knowledge and faith and immortality which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus, Thy servant; and to Thee be the glory for ever. Thou, Master Almighty, didst create all things for Thy name's sake; both food and drink. Thou didst give to men for enjoyment in order that they might give thanks to Thee, but to us Thou hast graciously given spiritual food and drink and eternal life through Thy servant. Before all things we thank Thee that Thou art mighty; to Thee be the glory for ever. Remember, Lord, Thy Church, to deliver it from every evil and to make it perfect in Thy love, and gather it from the four winds, the sanctified, into Thy kingdom, which Thou hast prepared for it; for Thine is the power and the glory for ever. Let grace come and let this world pass away. Hosanna to the Son of David. Whoever is holy, let him come; Whoever is not, let him repent. Marana tha. Amen!"

This voice from apostolic times—"so let Thy Church be gathered from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom"—seems like a summons unto Christians to-day to sit in unity at the Lord's table.

A theological professor of our day, commenting upon the Eucharist given in the "Teaching," remarks that there is no well-defined doctrine of the sacraments in it, adding that the term "eucharistias" in the text which he helped to edit, "seems hardly to have lost its etymological force." Happily not, nor had the communion table lost its divine fraternal force. The table of the Lord in those first days was the table of the children of the Father of the Lord. And the Eucharist was the thanks given "for the knowledge and the faith and the immortality which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus."

The observance of the Lord's supper did not end with the unction of the knowledge of divine fellowship. The partakers of one accord proceeded to give practical expression of their love. The food that was left was distributed to those who could not be present and also to the needy and to strangers. The first assault upon the new faith as originally received and practiced was made by converts from those learned in the schools of pagan belief. They were sincere converts, but they were unable fully to throw off their pagan training. Between the time of the communion liturgy of the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" and the meeting of the Nicaean Council (325) we find at work among the Churches a steady development toward philosophic and theologic interpretations of the observance of the communion. Justin in his first apology, addressed to Antoninus Pius, emperor of Rome, declares that Christians do not receive the elements "as common bread and common drink." Accordingly he declares that "as Jesus Christ, our Saviour, having been made flesh by the Word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food that has been blessed by the prayer of His Word and from which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh." Justin complains that the use of bread and

drink at the Christian communion "the wicked devils have imitated in the mysteries of Mithras, commanding the same to be done. For, that bread and a cup of water are placed with certain incantations in the mystic rite for one who is being initiated, you either know or can learn." Justin proceeds with his plea to the emperor:—

"When our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayer and thanksgivings, according to his ability, and the people assent, saying, 'Amen'; and there is a distribution to each and a participation of that over which thanks have been given, and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons. And they, who are well-to-do and are willing, give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succors the orphans and widows and those who from sickness or any other cause are in want, and the strangers sojourning among us, and in a word takes care of all who are in need."

A practise arising between the era of the full communion meal and the use of symbolic bread and wine only is indicated by this injunction found in the Apostolic Canon:—

"If any bishop or presbyter, otherwise than our Lord has ordained concerning the sacrifice, offers other things at the altar of God, as honey, milk or strong beer instead of wine, any necessities, or birds, or animals, or pulse otherwise than is ordained, let him be deprived, excepting grains of new corn or ears of wheat or bunches of grapes in their season."

The water mentioned in the canon quoted above was a nicety of speculative symbolism which may be properly credited to the learned converts. Says Clement of Alexandria: "According as wine is blended with water so is the spirit with man. And the one, mixture of wine and water, nourishes to faith; while the other, the spirit,

conducts to immortality. And the mixture of both—of the water and of the Word—is called Eucharist, renowned and glorious grace; and they who by faith partake of it are sanctified both in body and soul." He also declares that "it is not to be overlooked that those who feed according to the Word are not barred from dainties in the shape of honeycombs."

Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, born about the year 200, thus philosophizes on the spiritual significance of communion water and wine: "For if one offer wine only, the blood of Christ is disassociated from us; but, if the water be alone, the people are disassociated from Christ; but when both are mingled and are joined with one another by a close union, there is completed the spiritual and heavenly sacrament. Thus the cup of the Lord is not indeed water alone, nor wine alone, unless each be mingled with the other."

This spiritual symbolism bears the mark of pagan thought and reminds one of the doctrine of numbers as emblematic of the mind and soul elements in man, which Pythagoras taught.

This mystic treatment of the elements of the Lord's table must have had a tendency to turn the thoughts of believers from exemplifying in their daily lives the faith that was in them. It was in the maze of such theological speculations that the ideal of the primitive communion was lost.

The religious life of the first Christians centered in their common meal. When they supped together they knew that they were receiving spiritual food as well, and communicants were eager to go forth with food, both material and spiritual, for the benefit of others. The communion was partaken, of course, as a spiritual exercise, but the unction and exaltation of Christian fellowship did not end with the supper. The believers were moved to carry its blessings to others. In a word, the

Gospel was domesticated at the communion table. After the ordinance came the distribution of food and supplies to those who could not attend and to friends and the needy, when the ritual of giving thanks to God, the father was repeated. Thus were they following Paul's injunction—"But to do good, and to communicate, forget not." Paul charged the rich that "they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate." To distribute merely would have been charity; but they were enjoined to "communicate" also.

This word "communicate" was often on the apostle's lips. It meant to commune in both spiritual and material things. As Bishop Jeremy Taylor states, "The primitive Christians communicated every day"; that is, the contributions made on communion Sunday were daily carried to the needy, and the grace of the Lord's supper was the precious part of these acts. Or, to state it in another form, the first Christians always completed the grace of the Lord's supper by the grace of good works.

Let it be repeated for emphasis, the Gospel of Christ was domesticated at the communion table.

It is a dreary journey to take from the primitive Christian table to the Eucharist of Church history. One marvels at the sounding liturgies which in after years violated the quiet grace of the communion hour of divine fellowship. Schools of metaphysical and scholastic conceits set the table with doctrinal nicety, pushing it back farther and farther from the people and from the holy ideal of its birth. There were rencounters about leavened and unleavened bread, about the marvelous change of the elements, about fermented and unfermented wines, about the mystery of the ubiquity of Christ's body through the elements. There was the bloodless sacrifice. There were liturgies for many and wine for one. Then came a touch of art, an ornate communion table standing under a flood of stained-glass light in a setting of tinted cathedral walls

—and soft music; then other magic—water with wine in the communion cup—water cold and water warm, and divers other plain and mixed communion drinks; then mixtures more serious than drink at any temperature—a blending of politics with the Eucharist—communion a test of allegiance to Christian king—communion a very judgment seat and price of life or title to regal power.

Let him who will run the gamut of these invented Eucharists; the words of the Saviour remain in the sacred record:

If any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come unto him and sup with him and he with Me.

Why cannot the Christian men and women of to-day commune together in the light of the Gospel and seek for the lost ideal of the table of the purest brotherly love, living from day to day the faith and grace of their divine kinship? The time is near and the hour of the greatest of revivals has struck for the Church to draw about the communion board of the first days and to devote their spiritual exercise toward making a chart for their daily walk and conversation in harmony with the oracles of Christ.

Preaching and singing and exhorting, but doing nothing, cannot rescue Christendom from the distractions of the present. Between our lips and our acts is a chasm deep and perilous. Priests have talked Christianity to death; poets and choirs have sung Christianity to death; artists have carved and painted Christianity to death—but who lives it?

Without interfering in any manner with established Sabbath observances, let members of neighboring Churches meet in some parish house or assembly room,—say, at the Sunday-school hour, and, after they have partaken and given thanks in the knowledge that they are the children of God, the Father, let them turn in conference to His business in their neighborhood and to the

holy concerns of a "commonwealth of heaven manifested here on earth," as the Patriarch Chrysostom phrased it in his day.

And what a field for evangel work in the vast wreck of things—plagues of cold skepticism and Godless homage paid to riches,—plagues of benighted souls where no kindly word is spoken,—plagues of depravity and dirt in rural hovels and city rookeries,—plagues of wantonness where the starved heart or vicious mind runs to weeds in a social soil that kills,—plagues of ennui in the sheltered life where overflowing measures of selfish comfort fill the day with tired hours of uselessness in a civilization still crude from the lack of real workers,—plagues of mammon in the temples of the living God—all lying within the reach of concerted action, if Christians would live up to that part of their faith on which they all agree!

Such a communion would make laymen workers in the vineyard, now overrun with the wanton pastimes of the unchurched classes of every social grade. At such a communion the door for union might open to the Churches—and the lost ideal be recovered.

Mason A. Green.

Formerly Editorial Room,
Springfield Republican,
Springfield, Mass.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

In an article entitled "What Theology Needs" Robert H. Gardiner in *The Churchman,* New York, says:

Theology needs to be brought down to date, which is another way of saying that it needs to be brought back to Christ. Modernism has a bad sound in many theological ears and too much of it preserves the bad features of traditional theology in its narrowness and conceit, and, so far as it is merely destructive, it retards, instead of helping, the progress of the Kingdom. The modernism needed is the recognition that the theology of Christ is eternal and infinite, adapted to every problem of humanity and to endure to all eternity, and, therefore, applicable to the questions which are racking the world to-day. The province of theologians is not to prolong obsolete debates or to invent new and futile speculations of finite minds about the infinite mysteries, but to apply the faith once for all delivered to present conditions; to try to understand, and to teach us to understand, what is in the mind of Christ as He looks to-day upon the world He came to save, a world now weltering in blood and famine, in wars between nations and between classes, with selfishness rampant. Perhaps the Churches do not know enough yet to venture to pronounce on specific questions—the eight hour day, the open shop, the righteousness of war, and the like. If they do not, there is all the more reason for us who are churchmen, clerical or lay, in our studies, in our theological seminaries, in our offices or factories, to study with all our might to apply Christ's law to present day conditions, ready and eager, if that study shows that those conditions do not fit the law, to give gladly all that we have, all that we are, to change them.

* * * * *

If theology is to regain its proper place in human thought and affairs, it needs to show that the Faith is eternal, ancient yet ever new, eternally vital. It must teach us William Law's definition: "Now faith may be thus understood; it is that power by which a man gives himself up to anything, seeks, wills, adheres to and unites with it, so that his life lives in it, and belongs to it. Now to whatever the soul gives itself up; whatever it hungereth after; and in which it delights, and seeks to be united; there, and there only, is its faith; that faith which can work either life or death, and according to which faith, everything is, and must be done to man." Theology needs to be rewritten in terms of love, for the supreme fact of the world is that God is Love, and, because He is Love and has made man in His image, and man, if he wills, may be God's friend, sharing in God's purpose, love is the only power to solve the problems of a distracted world. Love, as S. Chrysostom says, is force, because it is the sharing in the Life by Whom all things were created. Who can doubt that if the faith, in

Law's sense, that God is Love, were ours, the visible unity of Christians would be attained and that the world would believe that the Father sent the Son to redeem mankind, and that His Law of peace and righteousness and love would reign supreme?

The action of the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance in its session at Pittsburg for the continuation of efforts toward unity called forth the following expression from *The Congregationalist,* Boston:

We are just now at a stage in the slow process of declaring and making visible that unity of the Church of Christ which the Free Churches, the bishops of the Anglican Church and its daughter communions alike recognize, when the most pressing needs are enthusiasm, patience, courtesy and freedom of discussion. The Lambeth Council, composed of Episcopal bishops, took a long step forward in its frank assertion that differences, yes, even from their own point of view, irregularities, of polity do not exclude from the fellowship of the Holy Catholic Church or destroy the fitness of other organizations than their own for use by God in His work among men. Bishop Manning, of New York, in discussing the continuing negotiations between his own Protestant Episcopal Church and the Congregational Churches put the matter in a different way some time ago when he said that the purpose of these negotiations was not to make Protestant Episcopalians of Congregationalists, but to ensure, from the Protestant Episcopal point of view, that they belonged within the ranks of the visible Holy Catholic Church.

That the Lambeth bishops were deeply moved by the discussions and conclusions of their Council is evident in their individual expressions since the sending out of its appeal. In an address before the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland at its meeting last May, the Archbishop of Canterbury showed this warmth of brotherly affection and this earnest desire for reunion. Himself a Scotchman, he was able to stress the points of sympathy as well as of difference between these two established Churches in the sister nations. He was not thinking, he said, of "a mere aggregate of devout Christian folk scattered up and down the world, but (of) the Society of Christ among men, the living Society which He founded." That is the ideal which inspired the Lambeth Conference to ask in regard to the divisions of the Catholic Church, "Is the fault ours? Is it remediable?" and then (with) a great yearning: "O, if so, let us under the good hand of God, repent of it and mend it if we can."

There are difficulties in the way of a complete and open fellowship which must be faced but there is a real danger that negotiations here and there may result in new divisions, as a part of some communion accepts and another part feels it necessary for its witness to reject the terms proposed for equal fellowship. About these difficulties there must be frank speaking and clear understanding.

Rev. George Hall in *The Australian Christian Commonwealth,* Adelaide, tells of Christian unity in that country as follows:

The utility of continuing the negotiations for the union of the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches of Australia has been called into question.

Why, it is said, in view of the strong opposition of a large section of the Presbyterian people, do we not drop the matter until the Church, which has twice initiated the negotiations, has proved that it is really in earnest about it? There is no doubt that since the meeting of the General Assembly of last year it has been difficult to go forward with any enthusiasm. The action of that Assembly heavily skidded the movement. It is difficult to see how, in view of the attitude taken by the opposition and the votes cast by Church members and courts, the Assembly could have done other than it did. It must, however, be remembered that in nearly every court of the Presbyterian Church there was a substantial majority of votes cast in favor of union, and that on the Basis prepared by the Joint Committee of 1918.

In a tabulated statement, printed in the "Minutes" of the Victoria and Tasmania Conference, it is shown that the Presbyterian vote was:—For union, 43,638; and against union, 29,733.

The Congregational Church vote was:—For union, 8,481; against, 1,705.

Such figures do not justify any proposal to abandon negotiations, but rather encourage us to strive, by a wise propaganda, to win over the minority.

In the same journal Rev. Alfred Gifford says,

We live in a big world, with stupendous problems, that no one denomination is big enough to cope with. We need united counsels and pooled resources. Also the Western world of to-morrow will be politically united. The most gloomy pessimism would be justified if we had to look forward to a disunited Church in a politically-united world. It was the glory of the Christian Church in other days to lead in Anglo-Saxon and other unions. Her unhappy condition to-day is rather that of a hindrance to the world-union our most enlightened leaders seek. A disunited Church is a negligible quantity in world-councils. Our denominations are only relics of half-forgotten conflicts. Union is needed for power and victory. It will not do to mumble stories of great days past, nor fight ancient battles over again, that can only issue in Protestantism imitating Bunyan's Giant Pope, crouching helplessly by the wayside, while the world's life pours past, unheeding or contemptuous. The conception of a United Church of Australia may restore the imperial idea to our faith, and we may capture this Commonwealth for Christ, but we shall never denominationalize it, much less the world.

The Archbishop of Canterbury in a recent address to his Diocesan Conference, said, according to *The Church Family Newspaper,*

We mean business. We mean, or at least I mean, to go forward, but not lightly or with mere sporadic independence and adventure.

We have to deal with difficulties which are centuries old. They are not going to be levelled or shattered in an enthusiastic week or by men and women who have given neither adequate study to the history of the past, nor adequate deliberation or prayer to the complexities of the present. There are no short cuts.

Some of our most fluent critics assure me that in our search for unity we are belittling the sin of schism. That particular criticism interests me a good deal, for if there is one motive force which lies behind our effort, one spirit which inspired us at Lambeth and has inflamed us ever since, it is the consciousness of the appalling gravity of the sinful schisms which have marred the influence and soiled the purity of the Church of Him who prayed, "That they all may be one."

That denominationalism has its origin in human frailty and not in divine wisdom is pointed out by *Unity,* Chicago, as follows:

Dr. Henry C. McComas reveals much of the true inwardness of religious denominationalism in his "Psychology of Religious Sects." He lays bare the central fact in the situation when he says,

"The differences which appear in the religious life of different denominations have their only justification in the differences of human dispositions and not in any divine preference. Nothing is more necessary to-day than the proclamation of this fact, for the heart of sectarianism is the belief that each sect is a divine favorite. When all religious people freely acknowledge that their differences are matters of individual tastes and temperaments, the real barriers to Church unity will be torn away."

Denominationalism, in other words, has its origin in human frailty and not in divine wisdom. We are people of one idea, that is all; and being essentially egoistic, we insist upon confusing our own idea with the universal will of God. If we could only learn a little humility, and come to understand that opinions belong essentially to the individual, not to the social group, least of all to what we know and recognize as God, then we should learn to relegate our opinions to the individual life where they belong, and form our religious associations on the basis of the common life in the community. The scandal of denominationalism will be done away with just as fast and as far as we transfer religion from the field of theology to the field of life, and find the reality of God not in intellectual conformity but in spiritual fellowship.

BOOK REVIEWS

For lucidity of style and fine poise of judgment in discussing Anglican theology there are no set of books that exceed in merit the series being prepared by Rev. Francis J. Hall, D.D., professor of dogmatic theology in the General Theological Seminary, New York. The eighth volume—*The Church and the Sacramental System* (Longmans)—deals with the work of the Holy Spirit, the idea and nature of the Church, the ministry, unity and holiness, catholicity and apostolicity, Anglican Churches, the dispensation of grace, the sacramental system and outward signs covering in all 242 pages. With the author's wide scholarship is his beauty of spirit, which always softens the theological differences, but leaves them clearly defined. In the section dealing with unity he names four notes: (a) numerical—Christ established only one Church; (b) organic—Christ is the head of the organism, which is vitalized by the perpetual and lifegiving indwelling of the Holy Spirit; (c) indivisibility—whatever external disharmony develops, either the organism maintains life or sinks to the level of a man-made *ecclesia;* (d) and generic likeness—the true portions of the Church necessarily possess its faith, ministry, sacraments, manner of worship, fundamental precepts and spiritual atmosphere.

He enumerates the following specific reasons for unity: (a) the will of Christ as expressed in His prayer in John XVII; (b) open disunity gives an uncertain tone and significance to the Church's voice; (c) reduction in external efficiency by rival and overlapping; (d) internal efficiency weakened; (e) and development of mutual love among Christians depends upon relations in the Body of Christ. How this unity is to be restored is expressed by (a) enlistment and direction of the convictions, attitudes, purposes and tempers which must control Christian leadership everywhere, (b) agreement in matters of faith and order, (c) reformation of unspiritual developments and removal of evil from the Church, (d) entire abandonment of denominational independence and diverse ministerial polities, (e) readiness to submit to such world-wide conformity in fundamental ritual and practice as will enable all Christians to practice their religion in its corporate aspects intelligently and without scruple, (f) and the acceptance of some constitutional polity that will visibly unify Christian forces throughout the world. Closing he says, "It ought to be clear to thoughtful workers in this great cause that the end in view will require much time as well as patient wisdom for its attainment. Such is the condition of every large achievement, and no achievement is larger than this. In particular, it is needful to avoid all forcing methods, and to be content with the more deliberate campaign of mutual education that has first to be carried through. It is not the prerogative of one generation to complete the work. On the other hand, relaxation of effort because of the remoteness of its fruition,

and by reason of disillusionment as to immediate results, is quite unwarranted, and is contrary to the divine will. To be led by the formidableness of the undertaking to deny the utility of our own seemingly insignificant contributions to its progress is to show lack of faith in the power and will of God to answer the prayer of His beloved Son. If God wills it, He will bring it to pass. But He never hurries."

The Old Testament stories, particularly those of Genesis, will never lose their charm to the mind of childhood; likewise to those of mature years they bear that same fascination. Dr. Alexander R. Gordon, of the Presbyterian College, Montreal, has both related and interpreted the stories of Genesis for young people in a beautiful little volume well named *The Enchanted Garden* (Doran). The forty-two chapters are short, interesting and beautiful, spiritual and poetic in interpretation, and usually appropriately closed with a poem. They are a storehouse of good things for young people and old.

One of the most fascinating books in autobiography is entitled *Finding a Way Out* (Dougleday, Page & Company), by Robert Russa Moton, successor to Booker T. Washington as the head of Tuskegee Institute. It abounds in interest from the first chapter to the close, written in a free, unaffected style and so racy that one does not want to lay down the book until the last chapter is finished. It is a fine answer to the possibilities of the Negro. With a background of slavery, although he himself was born after the Civil War, Major Moton tells his story with remarkable spirit of approach both to the uplift of his race and to the adjustment with the white race. To read books which tell of men rising from poverty to wealth is not to be compared with this story of a Negro finding his way out of ignorance and cramped thought to a place of such service as to make himself not only the leader of his race but the tactful intermediary to the white race in removing misunderstandings and establishing relations of confidence between the races. This book ought to be in every white Sunday-school library that boys and girls growing up in the atmosphere of the Church may have the proper attitude toward the Negro. Major Moton has made a worth while contribution to interracial adjustment that puts him by the side of his great predecessor Booker T. Washington. Both will live as prophets of interracial betterment.

Taking as his text "God is spirit: and they that worship Him must worship in spirit and truth," Rev. John B. Cowden has written a book of nearly 400 pages on *Christian Worship* (Standard Publishing Press). He discusses at length the subjective and objective sides of Christian worship. The chapters on the meaning, standard, origin, nature, emotion, character, object, progress and liberty of Christian worship are particularly helpful; likewise the chapter on Christian worship for the

remission of sins. In the chapter on the unity of Christian worship he presents what he calls the heptagon basis for unity, it being an analytical study of Ephesians 2:14-22. In verses 14 and 15 he finds the common standard of authority and the removal of differences; in verse 16, reconciliation; in verse 18 a common access unto the Father; in verse 19 a democratic brotherhood; in verse 20 the foundation of unity; and in verse 22 the units of union. Concluding this chapter he says, "He who said 'Christian unity will proceed from the circumference to the center' seems to have been a true prophet. Christian unity can be fully realized everywhere, both at the center and on the circumference and throughout the whole of Christendom, if only Paul's plan of unity is accepted and followed." The whole book is written in a fine spirit and will help anyone desiring a larger experience in the worshipful element of Christianity, from which all study of Christ and His religion should be approached.

One of the most interesting books against war is *The God of War* (Revell), by Dr. Joseph Judson Taylor. Its nine chapters stand out uncompromisingly against war and its methods of adjusting differences. The quotations from more than three hundred authors give convincing strength to its arguments, which would have been made even stronger had the wars of the Old Testament been associated with the inquisition before which Galileo was tried rather than the Lord's commanding their brutalities because of the sins of the people. Jesus is the revealer of God and the greatest argument against war rests in Him. Dr. Taylor has rendered a valuable service and his book will help to strengthen the conviction of those who are trying to find their way out of present day entanglements.

As a national plague smallpox has been abolished. Tuberculosis is being driven out by better methods of living. Roger W. Babson in his last little book entitled *Making Good in Business* (Revell) goes vigorously for the permanent elimination of panics and depressions by better methods of doing business. He finds the guide-posts to a successful career in six "I's"—industry, integrity, intelligence, initiative, intensity and inspiration. He contends that back of all business, whether good or bad, is the character of the people and that spiritual forces are the true fundamentals of prosperity. There is no better book that parents can put in the hands of their sons and daughters than this book. It is a strong, sane plea from an angle that will challenge the best in oneself.

Love, faith and life are presented as the Christian fundamentals in a clear, strong, logical book of the conservative type by Judge Andrew Jackson Bowen under the title *Each One His Own Priest or Knowing God* (Revell). He argues forcefully for the high priesthood of Jesus and the common priesthood of all believers. He names natural evolu-

tion, modern spiritualism, Christian science and pantheism as the chief obstacles. There is an earnestness throughout the book that holds one's attention and commends the spiritual passion of the author.

Talking to children is a happy gift. George McPherson Hunter in *Morning Faces* (Doran) has given us a beautiful book of fifty-two chapters covering 219 pages, with each chapter brimful of stories and lessons that could be none other than profitable to children of any class or community. The author has blended his art of story-telling with healthy moral lessons.

The Sword of the Spirit, by Joseph Fort Newton, Litt.D., D.D. (Doran), is the title of a volume of sermons delivered at the City Temple, London. These sermons interpret the international fellowship of Christianity, and the everywhereness of God, emphasizing the growth of the spiritual life as the key to the history of the world and of the meaning of life.

Dr. R. A. Torrey delivered a series of sermons on the great truths of the Christian religion in his own Church, which attracted large audiences, and afterwards put them in a book called *The Fundamental Doctrines of the Christian Faith* (Doran). They cover fifteen chapters and are strong utterances, abounding in lengthy quotations of Scripture and stirring appeals to conscience.

The Gospel of Matthew is the title of an exposition on that portion of Scripture by Professor Charles R. Erdman of Princeton Theological Seminary (Westminster Press), covering 224 pages. It is one of the most valuable commentaries on a brief study of Matthew to be found anywhere.

Dr. Walter Scott, Berkeley, California, tells in a beautiful volume of the home and school life of his son *Joseph Freeman Scott* (Privately printed), who died while a midshipman at the Annapolis Naval Academy. It is a loving tribute of a Christian father and may be read with profit by parents.

The Report of the Preliminary Meeting at Geneva, Switzerland, August 12-20, 1920, by Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Maine, is a most interesting account of the preliminary meeting of the World Conference on Faith and Order and indicates the opening of the door to a united Christendom.

Crime in America and the Police, by Raymond B. Fosdick (Century Co.) presents some startling conditions which only a united Church can face.

A Vital Problem of American Protestantism, by Rev. J. H. Horstmann (Evangelical Herald) is an interesting study of the relationship between Lutheranism and Calvinism.

Organizations for the Promotion of Christian Unity

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Inc. Having its inception in the work of Thomas Campbell, 1809, present organization 1910, President, Rev. Peter Ainslie; Secretary, Rev. H. C. Armstrong, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. For intercessory prayer, friendly conferences and distribution of irenic literature, "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." Pentecost Sunday is the day named for special prayers for and sermons on Christian unity in all Churches.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, 1857, President, Athelstan Riley, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, London; Secretary in the United States, Rev. Galbraith Bourn Perry, Cambridge, N. Y. For intercessory prayer for the reunion of the Roman Catholic, Greek and Anglican Communions.

CHRISTIAN UNITY ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND, 1903, Secretary, Rev. Robert W. Weir, Edinburgh. For maintaining, fostering and expressing the consciousness of the underlying unity that is shared by many members of the different Churches in Scotland.

CHRISTIAN UNITY FOUNDATION, 1910, Secretary, Rev. W. C. Emhardt, Newtown, Bucks Co., Pa. For the promotion of Christian unity throughout the world by research and conference.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION, 1896, President, Prof. Percy Gardner; Hon. Secretary, Rev. C. Moxon, 3 St. George's Square, London S. W., England. For cultivation of friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian bodies.

COMMISSION ON THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, 1910, President, Rt. Rev. Charles P. Anderson; Secretary, Robert H. Gardiner, Esq., Gardiner, Me., U. S. A. For a world conference of all Christians relative to the unity of Christendom.

COUNCIL ON ORGANIC UNION, 1918, Ad Interim Committee, Chairman, Rev. W. H. Roberts, Philadelphia, Pa.; Secretary, Rev. Rufus W. Miller, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia. For the organic union of the Evangelical Churches in the United States of America.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, 1908, President, Rev. Frank Mason North; Secretary, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22d St., New York. For the coöperation of the various Protestant Communions in service rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity.

FREE CHURCH FELLOWSHIP, 1911, Rev. Malcolm Spencer, Colue Bridge House, Rickmansworth, London, N. For the cultivation of corporate prayer and thought for a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND, 1895, President, Rev. Principal W. B. Selbie, Mansfield College, Oxford; Secretary, Rev. F. B. Meyer, Memorial Hall, E. C., London. For facilitating fraternal intercourse and coöperation among the Evangelical Free Churches in England.

WORLD ALLIANCE FOR PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES, 1914, Chairman, Most Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury, Hon. Secretary, Rt. Hon. Sir Willoughby H. Dickinson, 41 Parliament St., London, S. W. 1. For joint endeavour to achieve the promotion of international friendship through the churches and the avoidance of war.

CBP

VOL. XI NO. 4

"God gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation."

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than of those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are friendly to all indications of Christian unity and ventures of faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour—are parts of the Church of Christ and that the unity of His disciples is the paramount issue of modern times.

APRIL, 1922

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

2710 PINE STREET
ST. LOUIS, MO.

504 N. FULTON AVENUE
BALTIMORE, MD.

AGENTS:
Fleming H. Revell Company, *New York*
Maruzen Company, Ltd., *Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka* and *Sendai*
Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, *London, E. C. 4;* 100, Princes Street, *Edinburgh*

TWO DOLLARS A YEAR FIFTY CENTS A COPY

THE SPIRIT OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY

THE favorite figure in which the church of the first century set forth its conception of the Spirit of Christianity is that of "the Good Shepherd." The emblem which appears on this page is a reproduction of one of the early Christian gems.

"ONE FLOCK

ONE SHEPHERD."

"No one has written more appreciatively respecting this symbol than Dean Stanley in his *Christian Institutions.* It appealed to all his warmest sympathies. 'What,' he asks, 'is the test or sign of Christian popular belief, which in these earliest representations of Christianity is handed down to us as the most cherished, the all-sufficing, token of their creed? It is very simple, but it contains a great deal. It is a shepherd in the bloom of youth, with the crook, or a shepherd's pipe, in one hand, and on his shoulder a lamb, which he carefully carries, and holds with the other hand. We see at once who it is; we all know without being told. This, in that earliest chamber, or church of a Christian family, is the only sign of Christian life and Christian belief. But, as it is almost the only sign of Christian belief in this earliest catacomb, so it continues always the chief, always the prevailing sign, as long as those burial-places were used.'

"After alluding to the almost total neglect of this lovely symbol by the Fathers and Theologians, he says that it answers the question, what was the popular religion of the first Christians? 'It was, in one word, the religion of the Good Shepherd. The kindness, the courage, the love, the beauty, the grace, of the Good Shepherd, was to them, if we may so say, Prayer Book and Articles, Creed and Canons, all in one. They looked on that figure, and it conveyed to them all they wanted. As ages passed on, the Good Shepherd faded from the mind of the Christian world, and other emblems of the Christian faith have taken His place. Instead of the gracious and gentle Pastor, there came the Omnipotent Judge, or the crucified Sufferer or the Infant in His mother's arms, or the Master in His parting Supper, or the figures of innumerable saints and angels, or the elaborate expositions of the various forms of theological controversy.' But 'the Good Shepherd represents to us the joyful, cheerful side of Christianity of which we spoke before. . . . But that is the primitive conception of the Founder of Christianity in those earlier centuries when the first object of the Christian community was not to repel, but to include; not to condemn, but to save. The popular conception of Christ in the early church was of the strong, the joyous youth, of eternal growth, of immortal grace.' "—Frederic W. Farrar in *The Life of Christ as Represented in Art.*

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

A Journal in the Interest of Reconciliation in the Divided Church of Christ. Interdenominational and International. Each Communion may speak with Freedom for itself in these Pages as to what Offering it has to bring to the Altar of Reconciliation.

Vol. XI. APRIL, 1922 No. 4

CONTENTS

CHRISTIANS AND WAR 249
By Rev. Claudius B. Spencer, D.D., Editor The Central Christian Advocate, Kansas City, Mo.

SUBSTITUTES FOR WAR 266
By Rev. Francis Shunk Downs, Minister Market Square Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

REUNION 273
By Rt. Rev. Edward L. Parsons, D.D., Bishop of San Francisco, Calif.

THE CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR MOVEMENT AS A FACTOR IN INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL FELLOWSHIP 284
By Rev. Francis Edward Clark, D.D., LL.D., Founder of the Christian Endeavor Movement.

THE LAMBETH PROPOSAL FOR PRACTICAL CHURCH UNITY 298
By Rev. Newman Smyth, D.D., Congregational Church, New Haven, Conn.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY 304

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR 316

BOOK REVIEWS 318

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is issued in January, April, July and October. It is the servant of the whole Church, irrespective of name or creed. It offers its pages as a forum to the entire Church of Christ for a frank and courteous discussion of those problems that have to do with the healing of our unchristian divisions. Its contributors and readers are in all communions.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, $2.00 a year—fifty cents a copy. Remittance should be made by New York draft, express order or money order.

Entered as second-class matter in the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo.

CONTENTS OF

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

FOR JANUARY, 1922

DENOMINATIONAL DISARMAMENT 169
By Rev. J. J. Castleberry, Minister Walnut Hills Christian Church, Cincinnati, Ohio.

THE WAY TO A UNITED CHURCH 184
By Rt. Rev. G. H. Kinsolving, D.D., Bishop of Texas.

THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER AT GENEVA AND THE QUESTION OF THE UNION OF THE CHURCHES 194
By Nikolaos Evangelides (Metropolitan) of Nubia.

REUNION OF THE CHURCHES 216
By Rev. C. H. Shawe, Minister Moravian Church, Swindon, England.

THE LOST IDEAL. The Communion Table, as Observed by the Primitive Christians, a Basis for Church Unity 223
By Mason A. Green, Boston, Mass.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY 233

BOOK REVIEWS 237

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

EDITED BY PETER AINSLIE,
Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore, Md.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

RAYMOND CALKINS,
Pastor First Congregational Church, Cambridge, Mass.

J. A. CRAMER,
Minister Dutch Reformed Church, The Hague, Holland

ADOLF DEISSMANN
Professor in the University of Berlin, Germany

ALFRED E. GARVIE,
Principal of New College, University of London, London, England

HUGHELL FOSBROKE
Dean General Episcopal Theological Seminary, New York City

WILLIAM P. MERRILL
Minister Brick Presbyterian Church, New York City

GEORGE W. RICHARDS
President Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, Lancaster, Pa.

WILLIAM TEMPLE
Bishop of Manchester, England

NATHAN SÖDERBLOM,
Archbishop of Uppsala, Sweden

ALL editorial communications should be addressed to Peter Ainslie, Editor THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

SUBSCRIPTIONS may be sent direct or placed through Fleming H. Revell Company, New York City; Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai; Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, London, E. C. 4, or 100 Princes Street, Edinburgh.

SUBSCRIPTION price $2.00 a year—50 cents a copy.

CHRISTIAN UNITY CALENDAR

PENTECOST SUNDAY has been named both by the World Conference on Faith and Order and the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity as the day for special sermons on Christian unity, along with prayers to that end.

MEETING of the World Conference on Faith and Order. Washington, D. C., 1925. Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Me., secretary.

MEETING of the Universal Conference of the Church of Christ on Life and Work, perhaps in 1923 or 1924. Archbishop of Uppsala, president; Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City, secretary.

CHRISTIAN UNITY PRAYER LEAGUE

(Membership in this League is open to all Christians—Eastern, Roman, Anglican and Protestant, the only requirement being a notice by post card or letter of one's desire to be so enrolled, stating the Church of which he is a member. Address, Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, Seminary House, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.)

FOR FITNESS FOR LIBERTY

Saviour divine,
Who dost ordain unto us, who would be free,
Both inalienable rights and inalienable duties,
Reveal fully unto us that our lives are not our own.

Show us that freedom and equality demand from us
Tolerance, humility, self-sacrifice,
Willingness to share in onerous public burdens
And to subordinate our own opinions and interests to those of a majority.

Teach us to suffer fools gladly,
To be willing to see our own standards lowered,
That those of the masses may be raised.

Teach us thy divine patience,
Thy divine enthusiasm in self-denying service,
That so we may become worthy of thy liberty.

—*From "A Book of Prayers." Published by The Challenge, London.*

A PRAYER

ALMIGHTY Father, in whom we live and have our being, teach us how to find our way to each other, for thy integrity is not established on the earth until thy children are bound together in love. Help us that we may find the truth and live the truth as it is in Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom be glory forever. Amen.

OUR DIVISIONS ARE A CRIME

By our divisions we Christians are a hindrance to the Saviour in His work of salvation. We prevent men from believing in Him. Christian unity is imperatively needed that the world may see and acknowledge the Lord. Our divisions crucify Him anew. They expose Him to derision and contempt. Our divisions are not merely a drawback; they are a crime. Union is not only a beautiful idea; it is Christ's plain commandment and our unconditional duty. When you once perceive this your conscience can never more be reconciled to division. The lack of unity will burn you like fire. The desire for unity is not a fashion, a phenomenon of the time, nor a pious wish whereby men seek to conceal from themselves and others the hard reality, the cleft which history and the world crisis of our time have driven between men. No. Unity is a sacred obligation. The way to it is long and steep and stony. It leads through many hardships, great and small. Each one of these by itself seems impossible to overcome. But faith overcomes all hindrances, if only we are genuinely penitent, if we are aware of our guilt and ask forgiveness for our omissions which the Saviour judges with still greater severity than our offenses.

—Nathan Söderblom, Archbishop of Uppsala.

THE PRIDE OF DENOMINATION

THE pride of denomination is as strong in this day among Christians as it was among the Jews in the time of Jesus.

The shame of our schism is unobserved by most Christians and they walk with the pride of a peacock because they are members of this Church, that Church, or some other Church in the multitude of divisions in the Church of God, giving an unspiritual attitude to a world which is hungering for God.

CHRISTIANS AND WAR

Is it not somewhat of a reproach that the voices against war have come so faintly from Christian authority? Christianity is at its base a matter of brotherhood, of co-operation, of peace and good-will. It is an imperative of internationalism. If Christianity insists upon the peaceful adjudication of difficulties between neighbors, can it do no less to difficulties between neighboring sovereign States? Because Christianity is not a tribal religion under a tribal god, and not a religion bounded by clan, it is both in essence and in authority cosmopolitan and universal. Accordingly it would seem not only unseemly but an abdication of her very charter that Christianity should speak with a double voice, one in imperatives to the individual, and the other mumbling or silent to the State. The Church as the collective and corporate voice of Christianity should have stood against human slaughter as between States as it stood against it as between individuals. Once it did so. And should the State, as in Machiavelli—who "Has in practice become a teacher again"—and Treitschke, despise the authority of the Church, "pursuing its power as its only objective," the Church in our time should at least have made its voice heard and dared to go on record with all the Sinaitic fulmination of "Thou shalt not kill" against bloodshed between States as it spoke against bloodshed between neighbors; it should have at least tried to impose upon the collective conscience that restraint it did impose upon the individual. For a thousand years the Church did not do it. Before the spectacle of war the Church was an aspen leaf when it should have been thunders. It left the denunciation of war to philosophers and unbelievers. Of this Voltaire did not fail to remind the Church, and in doing so he had history on his side. The organized Church did not to any appreciable degree lift its hand

to ward off the world catastrophe that befell in 1914; but one consequence of that catastrophe is that the Church did discover her conscience in the matter, and with it its right, its duty, and its coming, insistent purpose.

What we wish to inquire in this brief paper is how this anomalous and debasing situation came to be and what are the grounds of the new discovery—which, as we shall see, is simply a rediscovery—that gives the Church the assurance to speak and be heard against the continuance of war.

I

Speaking in the large, and having in mind the course of the Church for some fifteen centuries, Christians, for one thing, looked at war from the standpoint of the Old Testament; and, for another, regarded war as a function belonging to the State and therefore little of the Church's business unless it was to bless the banners and share in the booty of conquest. But the Old Testament record did not express the attitude of the New Testament Church. The Old Testament mirrors the life of the world's youth, and its development out of the clan and its boundaries of interest and conduct into a cosmopolitanism and internationalism in which we seem quite at home to-day. In the early Semitic times the prevailing idea of gods as tribal deities was shared by the Chosen People. The deities of Egypt, Assyria, Moab, were tribal. What kings did, whether planning a temple or a war, they did under the direction and sanction of their deity. All victories were victories of the tribal god. The people sacrificed to him as they went out to war, looked upon the booty as his, and upon their victories as his. Hence the long praises to their gods in the inscriptions which become to us so tiresome. Fighting was first of all normal to tribal gods, then to the tribes themselves. Indeed fighting seems to have been rather the normal occupation of

the Egyptian and Assyrian deities, and the atrocities of the latter were beyond words.

It is not too much to say that the politics of Israel was tinged with this universal creed. In early Hebrew times the chief was accompanied by the soothsayer with his ephod, sometimes even by the sacred ark. Nevertheless the early wars of Israel no more tell against the morality of the high Old Testament ideal than the tortures sponsored by Philip of Spain or Cromwell tell against the ideal of the Gospel, and if some things that were early associated with the name of Jehovah are now repugnant to a generation living three thousand years later, those things should not be counted a reproach to Him or to His people. It would scarcely be becoming to expect them to be freer from prevailing ideas, the blood feuds, the clan hatreds and envies all around them than were those who fought in the Crusades or in the world war in 1914. The ancients walked in the light of their time. Perhaps we have done the same. At the same time a time came when there arose before the prophets a vision of a universal Fatherhood, a fatherhood based on ethical and spiritual principles rather than political retaliations and ambitions. Jehovah was seen to be larger than a favorite of one political community. He was seen to have in fact a kingdom without frontiers, and there arose in the vision of the prophets the "nearest approach the world has yet seen to a religion of humanity." What is our vision after the dreadful world war has spent the first chapters of its fury? We are the inheritors rather of the New Testament standard than of the Old Testament. What unique obligation does this entail? What, in other words, is the New Testament attitude towards war? And first, what seems to have been the attitude of Christ?

It is true that Jesus gave us no line-upon-line teaching as to war. But why should He? Did He on slavery? Moreover, the Holy Land was at that time a province of

the Roman Empire, and was governed by Roman officials with a Roman army. In that army Jews were not expected to enlist, and were not compelled to serve. But there stands the Sermon on the Mount, and there stands the intensified quotation of Jesus, "Thou shalt not kill." It is the first of the series of Mosaic mandates Jesus calls up in the Sermon on the Mount. And whilst there have been ever since the age of Constantine those who have put the Sermon on the Mount in one compartment and the relations of man to society, particularly as to force, in another, there have been those who have understood the Sermon on the Mount to mean what it said, that it, and not the evasion which explained it away, was the magna charta of a Christian society.

The Sermon on the Mount contains these basic words: "You have heard that it was said, 'Eye for eye, tooth for tooth.' But I tell you not to resist a wicked man, but if any one strikes you on the right cheek, turn the other to him as well. If any one wishes to go to law with you and to deprive you of your under garment, let him take your outer one also. And whoever shall compel you to convey his goods one mile, go with him two. To him who asks, give; from him who would borrow, turn not away. You have heard that it was said, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy.' But I command you all, love your enemies, and pray for your persecutors; that so you may become true sons of your Father in Heaven; for He causes His sun to rise on the wicked as well as the good, and sends rain upon those who do right and those who do wrong. For if you love only those who love you, what reward have you earned? Do not even the tax-gatherers do that? And if you salute only your near relatives, what praise is due to you? Do not even the Gentiles do the same? You, however, are to be complete in goodness, as your Heavenly Father is complete."

We do not care to enter the somewhat noisy controversy as to how far the applications of these words go. Tolstoi believed they meant what they said. It does not seem improper or unreasonable, however, to understand them to distinguish between the enduring of suffering and inflicting it. To show to what extremes men can go when they set up the claim of obeying the spirit of the passage whilst throwing aside its literal observance, it is only necessary to note that the Inquisition which took by torture its tens of thousands of lives was understood as within the Sermon on the Mount because the physical sufferings conduced to spiritual welfare.

We observe that Admiral Mahan uses the example of Jesus in driving the traders from the temple as an offset to the Sermon on the Mount. If we read the narrative in St. John, where alone the "whip" is mentioned, we will find it thus recorded: "He found in the Temple the dealers in cattle and sheep and pigeons, and the money-changers sitting there. So he plaited a whip of rushes, and drove all—both sheep and bullocks—out of the Temple. The small coin of the brokers He upset on the ground and overturned their tables. And to the pigeon-dealers He said, 'Take these things away. Do not turn my Father's house into a market'" (Weymouth's translation). We do not find that in this Jesus used the whip of rushes on any except the cattle—if we want to get down to the fine point of exegesis. It is not likely that one person could drive all the crowd out by physical force if physical force was all He relied upon. The fact is the force was moral. It was the grandeur and power of personality, the same that caused the Roman soldiers sent to arrest Him to go backward and fall to the ground when He declared to them, "I am He." In illustrating His teaching concerning the Kingdom of Heaven, and the cost of discipleship, Jesus used allusions

to war, as did the Apostle Paul allusions to the Olympic games, the gladiatorial contests and the soldier.

The limits of this paper would be strained if it attempted to include an examination of all the inferences as to the doctrine of war, for and against, founded on passages in the New Testament relevant more or less. There is an appeal, however, which strikes this writer as being apt and conclusive, and that is the appeal to the understanding of the new religion which prevailed amongst those who at the first experienced it and expressed its life, and amongst those also who from them immediately inherited its traditions, its "early uncorrupted instincts", and passed them on from life to life to the ends of the Roman world. What was the attitude of the early Christians towards war?

II

If we pass from the reading of the words of Jesus to the living interpretation of them by the early Christians, we shall find what those who were at the fountain head understood Jesus to mean as to war, and we shall see what understanding they lived out and died for during more than two centuries. This seems to us a commentary surpassing in weight any amount of subtle lexicography. The "witness" of the early Church to the meaning of Jesus explains what the word witness (martyr) means. With their blood they defined the attitude of the New Testament towards war. Evidently the basic doctrine of Jesus was love, the love of God to man, the love of man to God, and the love of man to his brother, and brother in this new order of the world was limited only by the human race. We read "We love because God first loved us." "If any man says that he loves God, while he hates his brother man, he is a liar, for he who does not love his brother man whom he has seen, how can he (Weymouth "he cannot") love God whom he has not

seen? And the command which we have from Him is that He who loves God must love his brother man also." This was the new lexicon of Christianity. Jesus had said, "A new commandment give I unto you that ye love one another." The greatest, strongest, deepest thing St. Paul ever wrote, declares Harnack, is the hymn commencing with the words, "Though I speak with the tongues of men and angels, but have not love, I am become sounding brass or a clanging cymbal." Harnack adds, "The new language on the lips of Christians was the language of love; but it was more than a language, it was a thing of power and action."

On this point we have two unexceptionable testimonies from very ancient writers. Lucian said of the Christians irrespective of their domicile, "Their law giver had taught them that they were all brethren, one to another." Tertullian stated, "It is our * * * practice of loving kindness that brands us in the eyes of many of our opponents. 'Only look' they say, 'look how they love one another'." Thus had the saying been really fulfilled, "Hereby shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one for another." Harnack observes that "the gospel thus became a social message", and Gibbon and Lecky have pointed out how this spirit passed over all barriers of race and caste and like leaven in the meal pervaded the Empire with a new ideal, with new hope, and with a new salvation from the despair that had fallen upon the glitter and games, the "vanity fair" and philosophy of the Roman world.

The writings of the "Fathers" show nothing more distinctly than that unbewildered by any fact the early Christians had a revulsion against bloodshed; rather they had a passion for brotherhood, for internationalism, heretofore unknown. So true is this that the early writings show that the Christians even looked upon themselves as a new, special order of people. They were in a

sense a third race. The expression "Greeks (Gentiles), Jews and Christians" appearing again and again in the large collection of the ancient writings assembled by Harnack indicates the young Church's basic conception of itself. So prevalent did it become that Hadrian who reigned perhaps fifteen years after the death of the Apostle John makes that division. "It is agreed," wrote Eusebius in his history, "that when the appearance of our Saviour Jesus Christ recently broke upon all men, there appeared a new nation * * * honored by all men with the title of Christ." This idea of Christians was perhaps expressed by St. Paul in the Epistle to the Philippians, "Our citizenship * * * is in heaven." In Hebrews there occurs the exhortation, "Let us go outside the camp * * * for here we have no permanent city * * * we seek one which is to come." This gave them the idea of a state detached. Tertullian wrote, "We acknowledge but one universal state, the world." This does not mean that Christians were not good citizens, but it does mean that in matters of good-will, of "seeking peace," of "righteousness," from the very first they looked upon humanity rather than upon clan or race as the basis of their ethics. Aristides writing to the Emperor said of them that they did not "esteem the Greek gods, nor the superstition of the Jews," that they were persecuted by both Greek and Jews, and that they derived not only their ethics but even their genealogy from Jesus Christ.

The ethics of Christ as to brotherhood, as to charity, and particularly as to the shedding of blood, as they had received it, they carried beyond racial frontiers. Tertullian called Christians "*gens totius orbis*" that is, "the people of the whole world." But was this—is it now—consistent with good citizenship? We know from St. Paul that the civil authority was distinctly recognized as a "minister of God," and as "appointed by God." St.

Peter follows up the fear of God with honor due the Emperor. St. Luke begins his Gospel with what Harnack considers a "complimentary" allusion to the Emperor Augustus, whose reign had inaugurated a new epoch—the new epoch of "peace"—which Christianity with its moral standards and purity, was dedicated to help the Empire to realize. In a letter to Marcus Aurelius a Christian writer elaborated this, showing how that "springing up in the provinces under the Emperor's rule, during the great reign of thy predecessor, Augustus, it brought rich blessings to thine (Marcus Aurelius) Empire in particular." In the mind of the Christians the Empire and the Christian religion together had constituted a new level of human history. Christianity in the world empire was sustaining inward force, a spiritual force supporting the states, as Harnack summarizes the rather lengthy letter, which he quotes in full.

Origen dwelt upon the high moral life of the Christian leaders in Athens, in Alexandria, and in other places; upon the standards of moral conduct they insisted upon; and upon what these meant to the public tranquillity, and even went so far as to compare the local "Christian assembly" with the local "assembly of the people." The Christians did with a succession of Emperors make a convenient outlet to befuddle the popular uprising. "The Christians to the lions" was all too frequently heard, but their lives did not justify the persecution. From the very first the admonition of Jesus, "Pray for them that persecute you," was literally obeyed. The "Teaching of the Twelve" written at least in the edge of the apostolic age commands, "Bless those who curse you and pray for your enemies, and fast on behalf of those who persecute you." Polycarp, who knew the Apostle John, enjoined on the Christians, "Pray also for kings and authorities and rulers and for those who persecute and hate you * * * that ye may be perfect in Him." Ignatius writes in the

same spirit to the Ephesians, where but lately the aged St. John had entered the Church leaning on two, and had given as his discourse the five words, "Little children, love one another." The early Christians taught forgiveness, and put away evil speaking. They inculcated the command to love and pray for their enemies. They were quiet, and pure, and industrious. They paid their taxes and prayed for the Emperor. They diffused their faith—that faith—all along the Mediterranean basin, in Caesar's household, among the aristocracy, and among the masses until when Constantine, for whatever political reason, brought down the imperial ensign from his palace and put in its place the once hated Cross of the Nazarene, he had only to take as it were a short step.

This bears directly upon our question. The Christians were men of peace. Every book in the New Testament speaks of "peace." Jesus said, "Blessed are the peacemakers." At his birth the angelic host sang, "On earth peace." Clement of Rome included in his epistle the prayer, "Give concord and peace to us and to all who inhabit the earth." And so on for many instances.

The early Christians appropriated the prophetic words of Isaiah and Micah, "And many peoples shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and He will teach us of His ways, and we will walk in His paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And He shall judge among the nations, and convict many peoples; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-knives. Nation shall not lift sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." This was the basic expectation of the Early Church.

Justin Martyr exclaimed, "We who had been filled with war and mutual slaughter and every wickedness, have each one, all the world over, changed the instruments of

war, the swords into ploughs, and the spears into farming instruments." Irenaeus says that "the apostles who went out from Jerusalem, effected a change to such an extent that the nations themselves wrought their swords and lances of war into ploughs and changed them into sickles * * * into instruments of peace." Tertullian quotes the passage and asks, "Who else therefore are understood than ourselves, who, taught by the new law, observe those things, the old law—the abolition of which the very actions (of changing swords into ploughs, etc.) proves was to come—being obliterated? For the old law vindicated itself by the vengeance of the sword, and plucked out eye for eye, and requited injury with punishment, but the new law pointed to clemency, and changed the former savagery of swords and lances into tranquillity, and refashioned the former infliction of war upon rivals and foes into the peaceful arts of ploughing and cultivating the earth."

"We have come," Origen says, "in accordance with the counsels of Jesus, to cut down our warlike and arrogant swords of argument into ploughshares, and we convert into sickles the spears we formerly used in fighting. For we no longer take 'sword against a nation', nor do we learn 'any more to make war,' having become sons of peace for the sake of Jesus, who is our leader, instead of (following) the ancestral (customs)." Eusebius quoted the passage and concludes his homily on how it would cure the evils of mankind by saying, "Which (fact) I regard as a very great proof of our Saviour's divine and irresistible power."

The reaction of this sentiment on bloodshed seems to have been universal. Harnack declares that Christianity prohibited on principle both war and bloodshed, and that the Christian ethic forbade war absolutely to the Christians. A Christian might not of his free will become a soldier. Athenagoras declared that Christians could not

endure to see a man put to death and for this reason they could not attend the gladiatorial games. Christians did not go into the army, and a soldier who embraced Christianity was supposed to leave the army. And it will not do to say that he did it through fear; the records are too full of those who having to make the choice between the sword in their hands and the sword on their necks chose martyrdom. The shedding of another's blood was more to be feared in the sight of God than the shedding of their own.

Any persistence of the idea, universal in antiquity, that wars were ordained by the national deities, whether Greek, Assyrian, Roman, or Semitic, did not affect the primitive Christians, and when in the course of time this discrepancy between the Old Testament and the ethic of Jesus did come to the surface, the ancient fact was used as an illustration—as St. Paul used the gladiatorial show or the Marathon races— rather than as the statement of a creed of life. It is pointed out that when in the theological disputes this sanction of war in the Old Testament came to a head not long after the death of the Apostle John, Marcion to be consistent held that wars were ordered by inferior deities and not by the God who was the Father of the Lord Jesus. This dualism, as Cadoux, to whose patient studies we are much indebted in these paragraphs, points out was rejected by the Christians, but Marcion held his ground. Neither side was right. The idea of a progressive revelation had not been reached by either side. The literalists sought to find "warlike features in the God of the New Testament," and thereby, says Cadoux, "imperiled one of the most essential features of the Christian Gospel." A schism resulted. There was no alternative. But Harnack observes that "it will always remain a credit to the Marcionite Church which long maintained itself, that it preferred to

reject the Old Testament rather than to tarnish the picture of the Father of Jesus Christ by the intermixture of traces of a warlike God. For a long time the "Fathers" exhibit a painful perplexity as to reconciling the common understanding with their individual duty. An interesting illustration is seen in the case of St. Gregory Nazianzen, who records the shrinking with which he took the hand of the Emperor, when invited to his palace, because that hand had shed so much human blood.

Analyze it as we may, the basic fact is that the early Christians condemned war, and not until the reign of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius is there any clear evidence of the presence of any number of Christians in the army of the Empire. Harnack notes individual cases, but the normal fact was that the one excluded the other. As late as the Council of Nice those Christians who, after abandoning the army returned to it, "as a dog to its vomit," were to occupy for years in the Church the place of penitents. Acting on this from the very outset the Church lessened the very horrors of war and tendencies to go to war. Athanasius, we are told, looked upon it as in reality a credential of the divine origin and power of Christianity that the Goths who were so warlike when they embraced Christianity abandoned their lust of constant war and settled down to the pursuits of peace, or agriculture and trade.

We cannot, then, rise from our studies of the early Church with any conviction other than of its repugnance to and condemnation of war, and we shall miss completely the spirit of the New Testament, as the early Christians incarnated it in their lives, if we take an attitude of repugnance and hostility any less keen and outspoken. There must be another way out. There must be an internationalism, a juridical process which makes war as dead as it is sinful.

III

The loss and recovery of the early ideal may be dealt with in a few words. The loss was incalculable. The force which had given mankind a new hope, which had attacked the old institutions of slavery, war, and even gladiatorial shows, and which had indeed preserved the Mediterranean world from despair, succumbed in turn to the blandishments of power. Rome offered the opportunity for aggrandizement. Constantine coquetted with the Church; but it was as a politician. When he opened the Council of Nice, which he intended should consolidate and standardize the new religion after the manner of the Empire, he appeared not as a humble Christian but as a barbaric hero and despot surpassing even the splendors of a modern papal parade. The hierarchy became rich; the episcopacy an aristocracy. Barbarian chiefs over night embraced Christianity without embracing its ethics. The glitter of the miraculous blessing on their banners was later repaid with the booty they brought back from their wars. Incidentally the waves of the Mohammedan conquest rolling over eastern Europe as well as Spain was a call to arms. "Every pulpit in Christendom," says Lecky, "for about two centuries proclaimed the duty of war with the unbeliever, and presented the battlefield as the sure path to heaven." "Many bishops and abbots," he continues, "partly from the turbulence of their times and characters, and partly, at a later period, from their position as great feudal lords, were accustomed to lead their followers in battle. This custom, though prohibited by Charlemagne, may be traced to so late a period as the battle of Agincourt." Within a given thirty years not less than eight bishops and two archbishops were killed fighting in battle. The wanderer about the great nave of St. Peters will see among the statues of popes one standing with a sword protruding beneath his vestments.

It is interesting to note how an archbishop of Mainz interpreted the New Testament. He slew nine foemen with his own hand, but did not use a sword for "that would have been contrary to Christ's word to St. Peter"—no, he used a club. The Old Testament wars were made use of when once the Church became the mistress of politicians and she herself in her aristocratic hierarchy entered the bloody shambles of will to power. It is true that by not a few ecclesiastics war was condoned rather than consecrated. There is the familiar story that when the Gothic Bishop Ulfilas reflected upon the fighting mood of the young Teutonic races of the North, truthful, chaste, courageous, but certainly men of blood—their gods a pantheon of warriors, their religion an apotheosis of battles—he refrained from translating for them the books of Samuel and Kings, explaining that those books were "histories of wars and his people were already very fond of war and needed the bit rather than the spur." Doubtless, too, the horrors of war were mitigated by Christianity, and this should be emphasized. But, concludes Lecky, "when all qualifications have been fully admitted the broad fact will remain that with the exception of Mohammedanism no other religion has done so much to produce war as was done by the religious teachers of Christendom during several centuries."

This eclipse of the attitude of the early Church proceeded to its logical results, even to our own times, even to the opening of this fateful century. Aside from certain isolated voices, the modern Church with the single exception of the Quakers perhaps, has at least accepted war. And in consequence the Church has been treated not as a spokesman of Christ on the matter, but as a somewhat mumbling if not negligible servant of the State quite sure to pray, "Right or wrong, my country," when war drew on, instead of exerting the last reserve

of her moral force to demand that difficulties be adjudicated instead of resorting to the duel of war as it now is.

The subserviency and acquiescence of the Church is basic in the philosophy of Treitschke and of Machiavelli, the two prophets of militarism. Of the Florentine Treitschke declared, "He freed the State in its morality from the Church." It did not arouse the Berlin professor to know that Machiavelli's book was called "The Devil's Catechism." "The essence of the State is power," declared Treitschke, and, "of all sins weakness is the most reprehensible, the most contemptible; it is on politics the sin against the Holy Ghost." Beyond question this got in the veins of the Church. The classic passage by which the war advocates silenced the Church was the sentence of Mozley's University Sermon wherein he denied the right of the Church to speak on the subject because the question of war is in the sphere of State and not of the Church. Thus except for a few names it has been left to the rationalists, Voltaire, Hume, Buckle, Comte, Spencer, and Tolstoi, and to the Socialists to make the protest against war that was made by the early Christian Church.

IV

There are signs of the Christian Church reasserting herself on war. This writer was one of the little group in Constance the day Germany declared war on France, when representatives of the Churches from several nations met to promote international good-will. The group did its work. It lighted the torch. It is to-day busier than ever, and more hopeful of success. The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America is doing not a little to express the early Christian attitude. It has no power whatever to speak for its constituent bodies. The Churches must speak for themselves. The propaganda for the settlement of difficutlies between nations

by international courts, backed by economic and other pressure, instead of war must go forward as in the first centuries, by man to man influence culminating in an omnipotent Public Opinion. Nothing can carry forward the hope of a new order of the world but what did it throughout the Roman Empire. It must be done by the Churches of Christ.

CLAUDIUS B. SPENCER.

Editorial Office,
Central Christian Advocate,
Kansas City, Mo.

FOR THE BREAKING DOWN OF BARRIERS

King of the whole earth,
Break down, we beseech thee, by thy great power,
All those barriers which do now keep mankind asunder:
Overcome the hindrances of race, of custom, and of prejudice:
Drive out all those adverse influences,
Which now mar our union.

Foster throughout thy world
Every movement of thought, of activity, of good-will,
Which tends, for whatever motive and in whatever sphere,
To break down isolation and exclusiveness,
To unite men in common enterprise and service,
To build up coöperation and interdependence.

—*A Book of Prayers.*

SUBSTITUTES FOR WAR

HUMANITY is engaged in another world war. It is the greatest of all wars. It is the war against war. The hour has struck when all peoples everywhere are rising in their might to do away with this monster that would destroy the race. It is not the opinion of a few or the conviction of certain interested groups. A consciousness that is world-wide is moving slowly along the avenues of human activity and a public opinion that transcends national boundaries is beginning to make itself felt. John Cowper Powys was right when he declared that for the first time in human history humanity was expressing itself consciously in a new-born public opinion.

"There is a world right that is greater than any national right, and the cry of humanity is greater than the cry of the militarist and the diplomatist."

At last we are coming to grips with the naked truth expressed so tersely by James Bryce, that "if we do not destroy war, war will destroy us."

Our chemists tell us that future wars will be more dreadful and destructive than any in the past; our economists prophesy bankruptcy for the nations that engage in them; our sociologists are not mere alarmists when they point to civilization itself decaying under the ruck and strain of war; and our biologists fear for the breed itself if the best blood is to be led to the shambles.

The instinct of self-preservation is arousing the race to action.

But there are more tender and more personal influences that are playing about the hearts of millions to-day. Fathers and mothers, sisters and sweethearts cannot forget the boy who gave his all. And those who died for us will not let us forget. As we think on their sacrifice, the immortal words of Lincoln at Gettysburg come to us with fresh meaning: "The world will little note nor long

remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought so nobly advanced."

Unless we enlist in this war against war, and find some remedy or substitute for it, will they not have died in vain?

They died, fighting for the right as God gave them to see the right. They gave, not counting their lives dear unto themselves. They call that we should follow in their train. They sleep in the confidence that we shall carry on.

Is there a way out? Can we win in this war on war? Can we overcome this evil and neutralize the probabilities of it in the future? I declare unto you there is only one way under the present arrangement of things on the earth.

In the home of a friend to-night a lamp is burning brightly. The mellow light glows through a shade that is pictured with the battlefields of France. The body of the lamp is a centimetre shell, across whose base is etched these words:

"They shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks."

Whatever our view of the millennium, and the events that lead to it, the prophet has here revealed a secret that the world needs to know and to make use of to-day. "Don't scrap your swords and spears," he cries. "Transform them! Transfigure them! Substitute for implements of warfare implements of usefulness! Convert your sword into a ploughshare!"

Professor Hocking, of Harvard, has a very suggestive book, "The Re-making of Human Nature." He shows how Christianity takes the great natural human forces of pugnacity, sex-love, and ambition, and transforms and

utilizes them as dynamic forces for the kingdom of God. No energy, no vitality lost—only changed.

William James, in 1910, wrote for the Association for International Conciliation a paper, which he gave the title "The Moral Equivalent of War." He has a word which we need to hear to-day. Patriotic pride and ambition in their military form are, after all, only specifications of a more general competitive passion. They are its first form, but that is no reason for believing them to be its last form. * * * The war-function has grasped us so far; but constructive interests may some day seem no less imperative and impose on the individual a hardly lighter burden. * * * So far war has been the only force that can discipline a whole community, and until an equivalent discipline is organized, I believe that war must have its way. But man will find a moral equivalent for war, for preserving manliness of type. It is but a question of time, of skillful propagandism, and of opinion-making men seizing historic opportunities."

Can substitutes for war be found? Can great ends be placed before humanity which will take all the fighting stuff of the race to achieve them? Has the day not dawned when men are beginning to feel that it is worth a blood-tax to build up the life of man on the earth? Let us war against the forces that would destroy the physical life of man. The Son of God said to those who would have called fire down from heaven for the purpose of destruction: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them."

We must war against disease and the conditions that make for disease. H. G. Wells could say only a few years ago that "nothing is more striking than to compare the progress of civil conveniences to the progress in military apparatus in the last few decades. House-appliances (in England) are little better than they were fifty years ago.

But the rifle or battleship of fifty years ago was beyond all comparison inferior to those we possess. No one has a use now for such superannuated things."

The cost of one battleship would build 8,600 modern homes. We must war against the habits and indulgences that destroy the purity and the strength of the body. Proper recreation must be provided for all. Competitive sports afford an outlet for the fighting spirit of youth, and are a mighty force upon the side of world peace. Individuals and nations must let off steam. Let us harness these energies in our fight against all forces that break down the bodies of men.

Let us war against the ignorance that holds men's minds in captivity. One-half of earth's millions to-day can neither read nor write. We heard Dr. Samuel S. Zwemer recently say that only three women in every thousand in Egypt can read. Not much hope for the Woman's Movement there. In our own land of opportunity the draft of a few years ago revealed an illiteracy that astounded the nation. Think also of the other millions who can do little more than read or write. The cost of one battleship would maintain nearly one thousand university-trained missionaries throughout the world for the next twenty-five years. And if you do not believe in missions, and want a substitute for war nearer home, then remember that "he that ruleth his spirit is better than he that taketh a city." To conquer here will take all the fighting stuff you have.

Think of the false ideas afloat on printed page and public platform to-day—more dangerous than the invisible germs that war on the flesh. Think of the inadequacy of the educational system of the world. It cries aloud for men and money and enlightened sympathy and support. Darkness cannot be fought by merely fighting against it. Turn the light on! He who was more than Teacher of truth can lead us in this war, and the banner

we can march under bears his own words: "ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." The cost of one battleship would endow four universities like Princeton.

Let us war against the forces that destroy the souls of men. There are such forces. Every man wrestles against those principalities and powers that are not flesh and blood. He is aware of that downward pull and lateral drift in his nature which every bridge-builder wisely takes into consideration. "The thief cometh not but for to steal and to kill and to destroy. I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." It is Jesus Christ who can give the clean heart and the right spirit that can make our national and international life what it ought to be. Former President Patton, of Princeton Seminary, was right when he said: "What the world needs is not an antiseptic, but an antitoxin." The blood must be purified, for war is not a biological necessity, but a spiritual disease.

Large armaments have failed to preserve peace. The blood-soaked pages of history pronounce that method a lie. America and the world have leaped at the plan of Secretary Hughes to scrap the instruments of warfare and to curtail construction. But is not the time ripe when we need to go further? When some one speaks angrily to you, it is a fine thing to hold on to your temper; it is a better and more constructive thing to give the soft answer that turns away wrath.

It is a great thing for a man to hold his passions in the iron grip of an unyielding will. It is a greater thing for him to be fired with the expulsive power of a new affection. It is one thing to scrap our battleships; it is another thing to show good-will to a sister nation in a positive and practical way. Jesus Christ points the way when he says: "Bless them that curse you, do good to

them that hate you." "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."

The United States of America has an unparalleled opportunity to demonstrate good will, and to go the second mile. Joseph Cook said, "The nineteenth century has made this world one great neighborhood; the twentieth century must make this neighborhood a brotherhood if the neighborhood is to be safe."

This winter, under the auspices of the Germantown Forum, I heard an interesting lecture on present day conditions in Europe. In the course of his address the lecturer referred to his visit to Serbia and spoke of the high estimation in which the United States was held by the people of that country. Then he made this significant statement: "It is not the armies or the navies or the wealth of America that arouses the enthusiasm of Serbians; it is America's relief work, her educational institutions, and her missionaries that have aroused Serbia's gratitude and affection." Along these lines of constructive service and good-will shall wars be brought to nought, and instruments of human upbuilding be substituted for implements of devilish destruction.

On the boundary line of Argentina and Chile there stands a monument cast from cannon of the two republics into one colossal bronze statue twenty-six feet in height and thirteen thousand feet above the level of the sea. The "Prince of Peace" stands upon the granite base, and in the stone one may read these words: "Sooner shall these mountains crumble into dust than Argentines and Chileans break the peace which they have pledged themselves at the feet of Christ the Redeemer."

There are more enduring and meaningful monuments than those of bronze, more practical and convincing evidences of a nation's good-will. I offer the following suggestion to the American people in the confidence that it

will call to their hearts and appeal to their national sense as a nation of practical idealists:

That a portion of the many millions to be saved by the limitation of armaments in the United States be given to the participating nations, to be used in the creation of foundations and institutions that will war against disease, ignorance and sin; to stand forever in these countries as living monuments of the Conference at Washington and to the ultimate ideas of peace it represents; and as in the case of China and the indemnity returned by the United States, to be a practical demonstration of the good-will of the American people, and thus cement the friendship of our sister nations and help to render wars highly improbable.

In Washington's Farewell Address, he laid upon his countrymen the injunction "to give to mankind the magnanimous and novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence." Our task to-day is to practice his international faith and give to the world a practical demonstration of our disinterested good-will.

Francis Shunk Downs.

Minister's Office,
Market Square Presbyterian Church,
Philadelphia, Pa.

REUNION*

The most pressing problems of the Churches of Christ to-day in relation to the world are, I believe, the creation of a Christian internationalism and the transformation of the present industrial system into one which squares with the principles of the Gospel. The most pressing problem for the Churches in their own life is the problem of reunion. The divisions in Christianity weaken immeasurably its appeal to the world. The Kingdom of God which is the business of the Churches to establish on earth must wait afar off, only a dream of faithful souls, until Christians, united themselves, can show to the world the glory of Christ. That was our Lord's own view as He uttered it in His great intercessory prayer. "That they may all be one," He prayed, "even as Thou Father in me and I in Thee that they also may be in Us that the world may believe that Thou didst send Me." The demand for unity in its deepest meaning is a demand of the heart. It is the irresistible hunger of souls who really know Christ to live in that fellowship of believers which the Lambeth Conference so eloquently portrayed. But this demand of the heart finds constant and insistent emphasis in the work which lies before the Christian world. Everyone who labors with his eyes fixed upon the vision of the Kingdom and his heart burning to see Christ exalted, finds himself day after day conscious of the weakness of Christ's appeal because of the divisions of His followers. And day after day he finds himself facing questions growing out of those divisions. Sometimes they are great questions which touch the roots of division, questions concerning doctrine and order and the steps which may make for a better understanding of the issues. Sometimes they are lesser questions springing from the

*Address delivered before the Diocesan Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, San Francisco, California, Feb. 1, 1922.

effects of our divisions in the attempt to Christianize the world order. They come week by week for judgment and decision. In education, in social service, and in missionary endeavor they come in the form of appeals for cooperation or of opportunities which no one communion can meet alone. Invitations to conferences, suggestions for exchange of pulpits, requests for addresses on unity follow one another in an endless series. We cannot if we would evade the issues. We must go forward and we must in loyalty to the Master go forward in the direction of unity.

It is imperative that we think clearly on this matter. I wish, therefore, to lay before you the principles which it seems to me must guide us in our practical everyday work and the application of those principles so far as they concern our work in this diocese. I need not say that the resolutions and reports of the last Lambeth Conference have been throughout a guide and an inspiration.

First of all we have to recognize that all baptized Christians are members of the Catholic Church of Christ. All these Christians of whatever name hold in common the one great fundamental faith in Christ as their divine Saviour. That is the thing which marks them off from the rest of the world. To this fact and its bearings we give far too little weight. Our differences have through controversy and the exigencies of social and political conditions loomed so big that we have come to think of them as fundamental in character. They go very deep it is true; but the Christian faith itself goes deeper. Those who have found Christ have become new creatures in Him. The spring of life is different. In the non-Christian world the true Christian knows his brothers. We, in what we call a Christian world, often forget our fundamental unity with them. But we must not forget. We must put first things first. We must see that the

order of importance is first Christian, then Catholic or Protestant, Roman, Greek or Anglican.

In the task of Christianizing the world, therefore, our first concern is in making Christians, not in making a particular kind of Christians. I mean by that that we must deal with all our work in relation to the work of other Christians; we can never go it alone; we must always act with a view to the supreme task of making men followers of Christ. We must deliver our attacks where so far as we can see they will count most towards a Christian world. We aim to make Episcopalians or Churchmen or Catholics (we know ourselves by all these names) not as an end in itself but as our contribution to a cooperative task.

The coöperative character of the task laid upon us finds illustration in the next principle of action, the principle of what I call Catholic responsibility. The tradition of Catholic order which we claim to cherish is the very antithesis of a careful attention to our own alone. It compels us to be more than Episcopalians. In its essential character it breaks all the narrow sectarian bonds for to be Catholic is precisely not to be sectarian. The Catholic tradition to which I refer is that which regards all the Christians in any one district or area as belonging in One Body and therefore constituting the charge of those who hold responsibility for the Church. In an old English parish the priest looked upon all the people as his people. The more definitely a bishop believes his charge committed to him by God as representative of the ancient and undivided Church the more surely must he be convinced that he must answer to God for the way in which he has discharged the task of strengthening the Christian life of all who call themselves Christians; and of reaching those who are not. Nothing Christian, nothing human can be alien to him. It is his business to know how Christians

of other names feel; to be in touch with their life, to be behind every movement which helps to Christianize the world. But nowhere in the world to-day can the bishop of any communion attempt to lord it over those who owe another allegiance. If then a bishop will exercise his Catholic responsibility aright and be a bishop in the Church of God and not primarily a bishop of a particular communion there is only one path open—that is the path of fellowship. He has to further the great common cause of the Kingdom of God, the task of making Christians and a Christian world order: and he has to commend by their fruits in charity and breadth and consecrated devotion the special values and significances, the special interpretations and emphases of truth which are our own heritage. As for bishop so for priest and so likewise for people.

But fellowship means trust in those with whom we recognize this tie. It means humility and teachableness. We do believe that we have a great contribution to the common life of Christians; but we have forgotten altogether the meaning of that essential Christian virtue, humility, if we think that our work is completed by declaring our own incomparable inheritance and assuming that none other has any contribution. The worst form of heresy and schism which I know is that which arrogantly classifies some hundreds of millions of other Christians as heretics and schismatics and forgets that the blessings of God go to the poor in spirit and the meek. In that attitude except indeed where it is purely conventional there is nothing of the spirit of the little child. With the humility and trust of real fellowship we enter therefore as far as we can and wherever welcome into the life of other Christians whether they be Protestant or Roman or Orthodox. Following the injunction of the Lambeth Conference we join with them in social and edu-

cational work in the Church Federations, in conferences and the like. We cultivate every step which makes for mutual understanding, for coöperative strength and for the spread of the Kingdom of God. We interpret our Catholic responsibility as everywhere concerned with the interests of all Christ's people,—yes, of all God's children.

But in this emphasis upon the fundamental unity of all Christians and the Catholic attitude towards the various phases of Christian life and doctrine we must not forget that our practical aim is not to get an efficient machine but to discover God's way to the creation of a Church which is Catholic in fact as well as in name. We are seeking not to get Christians to work together on practical tasks. That is only a means or a beginning. We are seeking to bring them to worship together, to partake of the same Eucharist, to live together in God, to knit themselves together in one organic life and to fight the warfare of Christ as one army. We are concerned with what is called organic unity; and therefore all projects for practical coöperation must be viewed in the light of that great end. The more clearly others see that, the more intimately are we sure to work with them and the more readily can we take risks in the great adventure for Christ. But many things which to the man in the street seem ways of unity we must regard as valueless or worse. The opening of our pulpits to other ministers and the availing ourselves of opportunities to preach in theirs, when each goes with a sense of bringing some message which contributes to better understanding, has its definite value. But exchange of pulpits in a perfectly haphazard way merely for the purpose of exchange cannot take us far. We must not imagine that any of these things are specifics. There is no specific for the healing of Christ's wounds save the spirit of humble, teachable love. So likewise as I shall point out in a moment there are definite

ends to be attained by the affiliation, formal or informal, of the great communions in the so-called Community Church plan; but the union or undenominational Church which so easily captures the imagination of that same man in the street is a perfectly irrelevant thing. Whatever its immediate and local success the net result of its activity is to cut its members off from those great bodies of Christians which alone to-day represent the universal Church. It has no significance for the reunion of Christians because that reunion can be accomplished only by the gradual merging of the great communions into one another. All plans and proposals for coöperation must be viewed in the light of their relation to organic unity.

Finally we have in all this matter to cherish the special trust which God has committed to us. We have the great glory in this Church of much diversity of doctrine. We differ as to the doctrinal meaning of much in our Church and Christian life but we differ little as to the religious and spiritual values enshrined. We differ greatly, e. g., about the ministry; but no one of us would feel that this particular heritage which has come to us from the past could be lightly put aside. We believe that we have definite values of many kinds committed to us too precious to be depreciated or disregarded. They are a trust. The Catholic Church of the future can never be built other than with the recognition within it of all those phenomena —those rites and customs and habits and methods— which have given genuine spiritual aid to devout souls. But neither can it be built with the recognition that no one type of Christian can impose upon all the rest the acceptance of his particular way of knowing the grace of God. The importance of the Nicene Creed which exists to bring out just one fundamental faith about Christ, as a basis for unity or of our own Church's appeal to the Bible as the final test of what is necessary to salvation

lies precisely in this disengaging of the essential from the personal and transient. Our types of Churchmanship, our parties, our schools of thought are all valuable until the moment when any one of them attempts to take possession of the field and measure the Catholic Church of Christ by its own foot rule. To be good Churchmen we do not have to surrender any convictions or values but we do have to keep them in the background many times. That is the only way men live in families. That is the only way we can live in the Church. That to come to my point is the only path along which unity can be found. And thus in all our coöperation we must often put in the background the things we value. But that does not mean surrendering them, treating them as of no worth or giving the impression that they count little for us. Furthermore, we have our own people to provide for. We cannot desert them. We cannot leave them without those ministrations which they have learned to value and above all without the Holy Communion administered according to the use of this Church.

The membership of all Christians in the Catholic Church with its recognition that the first and most important step for the world is that men be Christians rather than special kinds of Christians; the sense of our own responsibility, as inheritors of the Catholic tradition for furthering the work of Christ wherever it may be found together with the fellowship with other Christians which grows out of that; the clear understanding that our goal is real unity and not mere casual and temporary cooperation and the constant regard for the sacred trust which we believe is ours—those are the principles which it seems to me must guide our daily work in our relations with other Christians. What they sum up to is that our work is coöperative, not competitive. We are not in the field to drive others out; but to contribute to the common life those things which give us our profound convictions

concerning our own interpretation of Christianity. We are in the field to further the interests of the Episcopal Church but only as those interests serve to further the efforts of the "blessed company of all faithful people" to transform the community, America and the world into the Kingdom of God.

In addition therefore to the care of the work which is our own, we have taken part in the work of the Federations of Churches, both State and local. We have given constant and fine service through both the Superintendent of Education and the Executive Secretary of the Council to the movements for week-day religious schools and the training of teachers for them. Indeed, there is no point where the "go it alone" principle is so obviously inadequate as in this movement which involves the most comprehensive and representative approach to the educational world. Denominational week-day schools of religion may in many cases turn out to be the wisest course; but independent denominational approach dooms the movement to failure. We have endeavored with the most careful attention to the needs of our own people to further the work which the Council of Comity, an advisory body representing all the chief Christian communions of this part of the world with the exception of the Church of Rome is trying to do in economizing Christian effort. The Congregational Church in the Potrero is closing its doors and its people are asked to worship at the Good Samaritan, maintaining whatever denominational status they desire. In the district south of Twin Peaks a large community Church has been built at Westwood Park. By keeping in touch with these plans through the various denominational representatives we shall be able to place our new Church in a far more advantageous position than at first planned and know that in the great responsibility of reaching the unchurched people it will have a neighborhood into which no other orthodox Christian body will

come. When one thinks of the larger issues one sees how futile it is to put three or four churches within a few blocks and leave great areas unchurched where the population is still sparse and the districts purely residential. On the Ocean Shore and at Ocean View further plans are in progress. At North Beach we have acted as representatives of the P. B. and C. and through the Rev. Mr. Moore have coöperated in the Italian work in that district. It is a most important field and I trust that the diocese may soon be able to add something to the small appropriation made by the National Council. In the Salinas Valley field our Church is in several communities the only Church and the vicar is working with fine vision to make it fill the need.

At Atascadero the situation has not developed clearly. We are maintaining services for our own people but up to the present time the way has not opened for any affiliation with the Federated Church. In order to have such affiliation it is absolutely necessary that the entity of our own group of Church people be preserved and recognized and full opportunity given for such religious privileges as we are able to give them.

Last but by no means least in importance are our relations of growing fellowship with the Orthodox Eastern Churches of this region. We have now had two united services in the Cathedral in which both Greek and Russian priests have taken part. With the elevation of Archbishop Meletios to the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople we may hope for further steps towards that inter-communion for which so many of us long and pray and which if it can be consummated ought besides its world values to help greatly in our American life. Towards that consummation, we of this diocese will try to do our part with open mind and Christian affection.

Thus I have tried to put before you the situation in this diocese in relation to this supreme problem of unity.

It is only on a microscopic scale, the kind of thing which is going on everywhere under the compelling guidance of the Holy Spirit. Here as elsewhere the situation has many difficulties. There are perils and dangers. Of that there can be no doubt. But how can we hesitate? The Lambeth Conference urges Christian people to face the task. "This means," says the Appeal to All Christian People, "an adventure of good will and still more of faith for nothing less is required than a new discovery of the creative resources of God. To this adventure we are convinced that God is now calling all the members of His Church."

There can be no doubt of the obstacles in the path. It is easy to see the dangers. It is easy to picture the peril in which a false step may place things we have counted most dear. It is easy to draw back, to stand still, appalled by the magnitude of the task. But thus are battles lost. We dare not do other than be daring for indeed God is calling the members of His Church. He calls through the longings of Christian love unsatisfied by the scanty and partial fellowship of to-day. He calls through the needs of America and the world. Better labor conditions, better living conditions, more adequate safeguarding of our children and our youth, finer homes and a higher view of the meaning of marriage, an industrial system freed from the bondage of paganized competition and seeking in democratic coöperation to build up a commonwealth of character,—one fills out the lines of the picture of the future as the Christian's heart draws it for America, the lines which faintly suggest the glory of the Kingdom of God; and as one's heart burns within him at its beauty there comes the sound of God's voice again calling Christ's followers to unity that the power of Christ may be known among us.

From across the seas comes this same divine appeal. The starving children of Russia dying because men hate, the mourning mothers, the helpless fathers, the bank-

rupt governments, the greed and lust-controlled peoples of the world call—and surely it is God's voice that we hear in the call to Christ's followers to heal the wounds of His Body that the wounds of war and hatred and greed may be healed. Thank God for the steps forward, groping though they are; for the Conference on Armaments and its positive contributions, for the League of Nations, herald of a new world order; but let the slight achievements never dull our ears to the call of God to all His children to live together as His great family. And that consummation! Does it not wait for the reunion of Christ's followers? When with the guidance of the Holy Spirit we have created that great Catholic Church—the dream of the creeds and the hope of the prophets of all ages—in which all men are gathered as in one family and men know themselves as Christians first and only then as Americans or French or Chinese, when that great Church has come into being nation can no longer be set against nation nor shall they learn war any more. The hope of the world is Christ; and the Master stands baffled and helpless while His followers are divided, His army broken, His Body bleeding with the wounds inflicted by our selfishness and littleness. To pray, to work, to sacrifice for that unity, what greater adventure, what more worthy task can any Christian undertake? Day by day it is my earnest prayer that in this diocese we may have a work done big with meaning for the Kingdom of God, a great strong on-moving work; but even more earnestly do I pray that we may have a great vision, a vision bounded only by the multitude of the children of God and satisfied only by the beauty of His Kingdom, a vision so great that littleness and prejudice and ignorance fade in its glory and our whole Church life becomes splendid with the splendor of God.

EDWARD L. PARSONS.

Bishop's House,
San Francisco, Calif.

THE CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR MOVEMENT AS A FACTOR IN INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL FELLOWSHIP

My good friend, the editor, has asked me to write on this subject which perhaps could have been treated more modestly and impartially by some other writer. Yet it is an interesting subject, and the providential features are so conspicuous that it can be treated without reflecting any glory upon any individual.

There was certainly no intention of forming an interdenominational and international movement when the first Christian Endeavor Society was formed. It was a very modest affair, just a humble experiment of one pastor to help his young people to a larger religious life and experience, and to greater activity in the work of the Church.

There was no thought, when the first little society of fifty-eight members was formed in the Williston Church, of Portland, Maine, on February 2, 1881, that there would ever be another Endeavor society. But God had a use for the idea far more comprehensive than any one at the beginning conceived. It was eight months before another society was formed, and for years it was considered a doubtful experiment even by its friends, and was openly scoffed at by its opponents and by the indifferent. Yet it steadily won its way in spite of considerable ecclesiastical opposition lest it trench upon denominational prerogatives, and in spite of the latent distrust of young people on the part of many pastors and church leaders.

I would not say, however, by any means, that this distrust or opposition was universal. Tens of thousands of pastors were thinking along the same lines, and the surprising thing was, not that there was opposition and indifference, but that such a multitude of pastors and lay-

men very soon recognized the Society's possibilities and heartily adopted its plans.

Within three years the first society outside the boundaries of the United States was formed in Honolulu, which was then under the dominion of Queen Liliuokalani. Within a few months after that a society was formed in China by a young missionary who was not afraid to try an experiment, and who had tested the value of its principles as a layman in his own home Church in Connecticut. India, too, at about the same time began to form Christian Endeavor Societies, and they now number there more than two thousand, while China has enrolled over twelve hundred such organizations.

Progressive Australia soon fell in line, but it was some seven years after the first society was formed that more conservative England and the continental countries adopted in a multitude of their Churches the Christian Endeavor movement as a means of Christian nurture. The providential character of this growth has been still further shown by the inconspicuous means that God used for its introduction into these countries. A newspaper paragraph, a letter from a young mechanic in Williston Church Society to his old pastor in England, a call by an American sailor boy on a pastor in Australia, the visit of a philanthropic American to a shipwrecked sailor in a Jamaican port, to whom a good lady had sent a paper which contained something of the Christian Endeavor story—these were the instrumentalities used of God to spread the knowledge of the movement.

In many countries the Society could not have had, at first, humbler exponents. We can account for its growth only by ascribing it to a good Providence. Within a few years the Society had become truly international.

Within the same length of time it had become just as truly interdenominational. Every leading denomination in the United States had formed such societies on the

lines of the "model constitution" of the first society, and called them by the Christian Endeavor name. For eight years there was no break in the interdenominational ranks. As early as 1887 two thousand young people from all the leading denominations attended the convention at Saratoga Springs. The following year five thousand attended a similar meeting in Philadelphia, while the numbers attending these meetings steadily increased, until more than fifty thousand *registered delegates* have been recorded at a single convention, where representatives of every denomination and almost every subdivision of the denominations, came together in a spirit of harmony and good-will.

In 1889 the first break in this delightful comradeship occurred when the young people of the Methodist Episcopal Church were required by order of the bishops to change their nearly two thousand societies into Epworth Leagues, with a constitution and methods of work similar to the Endeavor Societies, though they were called by different names. This necessarily withdrew them from the fellowship of the Endeavorers, as it was meant to do, much to the distress of a multitude of Methodist young people and many of their pastors.

At once several other denominations followed this example and formed strictly denominational organizations, built on much the same lines as those of the Christian Endeavor Society. It looked at first as though the fellowship of these eight years of common plans and methods and of common service would be broken up entirely and as though the fond dreams of Christian unity through the common efforts of the young people of the Churches would be shattered. But gradually the other denominations gave up their exclusive young people's organizations, or allowed the members to freely choose the interdenominational organization if they wished to do so. Then the break was only partial and temporary, and

there has never been a year of all the forty-one which tell the story of Christian Endeavor when the movement has not been stronger and larger at the end of the year than at the beginning.

There are still a few Christian Endeavor Societies in Methodist Churches, especially in Philadelphia and vicinity, while throughout the world there are more Methodist Endeavor Societies than in any other one denomination, for among the Primitive Methodists of Great Britain, the United Methodist Free Church of England, the Irish Methodists, and all the Methodists of Australia, where the followers of Wesley are the strongest of all the denominations, no other young people's society than Christian Endeavor is found. This is also true of the vigorous Methodist Protestant Church of America, and of the African Methodists, and several of the smaller divisions of that prolific family. I write in no spirit of discouragement concerning the interdenominational future of the movement, and certainly not in any spirit of bitterness, realizing that every denomination has a right to control its own young people. This, indeed, is one of the cardinal principles of the Endeavor movement.

Yet it does seem a pity that, especially in missionary lands, where Christians, at the best, are few and struggling, the young people should not be allowed to have a common denominator, uniting them as Christians instead of calling themselves by different names, holding different conventions, and perpetuating American shibboleths. Were it necessary or wise I could relate some unhappy incidents of the separation of young people into denominational camps on the mission fields which have caused not a little heart-burning.

I need not explain to the readers of this magazine that the idea of loyalty to the local Church and to its own denomination is even more fundamental to the Christian Endeavor movement than the idea of fellowship with

other Christians. No society can long exist that is not heart and soul faithful to its own Church, its pastor, its services, its doctrines and its missionary work. In all these forty years very few incidents have been brought to my attention when such fealty to Church and pastor has been disregarded.

I need not dilate on the possibilities of service which a united company of young people can accomplish for Christ and the Church. There are, I suppose, some fifteen hundred Christian Endeavor Unions in the United States—state, county, district and city unions. Every large city and almost every considerable community has such a union, bringing, two or three times a year, all the young people of the societies into meetings for praise and prayer and conference for inspiring addresses and for the planning of future work. Some of these union meetings are very large. In single cities or large local unions, as in Chicago, Los Angeles, and many other places I might mention, the audiences are often numbered by thousands, while single state conventions sometimes reach five thousand in the number of their delegates.

I do not claim, of course, that the value of a convention can be gauged by the number in attendance, but it is certainly of interest to know that in meetings for purely religious ends, many thousands of young people, representing nearly fifty different denominations, can come together in enthusiastic fellowship and hearty good-will. In the Pennsylvania Union alone, I am told, forty-seven different denominations are represented, and in our national union a still larger number.

Naturally these great gatherings make it possible to secure leading pastors and laymen with eloquent tongues from all parts of the country, who thus have an unrivaled opportunity of influencing the lives of a multitude of the youth of America. The representatives of each section and denomination and, in the world's conventions every

country, can thus bring their own special contribution and message to the youth of all these different sections and sects.

It is no less evident that social service of many kinds can be undertaken by such groups and unions of young people that no one Church or denomination could possibly do alone. Fresh Air Homes, for instance, which some unions, with the approbation and advice of their Churches and pastors, have established and supported for many years, have been productive of great good, not only to the beneficiaries, but also to the young people who perform the service. The Floating Christian Endeavor work in which Philadelphia, San Francisco, San Diego young people, and many living in other ports in America engage, has been of great value. Our British brethren have carried this work even further than we have in America, and the Endeavorers of Liverpool, London, and other cities visit hundreds of ships and write tens of thousands of letters to the sailors every year.

Many unions make a specialty of visiting hospitals, prisons and reform schools, when they are welcomed by the authorities, for short services of song and prayer, and even life-saving stations and car barns have often felt the influence of the city local unions. Some unions carry on evangelistic meetings every summer in tents pitched on vacant lots, on the streets, or on the greens in front of their own Churches. It would be wearisome if I should attempt to tell of all the lines of work which these unions undertake, and which would be impossible for any but a large and vigorous band of united young Christians to accomplish.

In great national reforms, like the prohibition movement, the effort for purer movies, for the suppression of prize fighting and other iniquities, these unions have often made themselves felt, and always on the side of good morals and righteousness. When the recent Washington

Conference was first proposed the efforts of our statesmen for disarmament were heartily backed up by petitions representing some millions of American Endeavorers, and I have many letters from the leaders of American life and in the high offices of the nation which express gratitude, and none of them resentment, at these efforts of the young people.

Perhaps the influence of the Christian Endeavor movement in promoting *International Fellowship* may, in the end, be quite as important as its influence on matters of Christian unity and comity at home. I am writing this article from one of the large cities of Germany, and find that so far as the Endeavorers are concerned, the bitterness and wrath of the war years have disappeared. In the many visits I have made to this land during the last thirty years I have never had a more cordial welcome. The Endeavor Societies have far more than doubled since the war began, and, though recognized largely as an English-speaking organization, so far as the vast majority of its members are concerned, it was not hampered in its work even in the most strenuous days of the war, as I feared it would be. If a fellowship movement can stand such a terrible strain as the war put upon it, it can stand anything except ecclesiastical indifference or hostility.

In the course of these thirty years I have visited every considerable country in the world, many of them several times, and have found that the common interests of the Endeavorers in all these lands have discouraged anything like racial or national enmity. In Japan they have withstood the nagging and the pin pricks of American racial superiority and dislike. In China the Society was not weakened but rather strengthened by the terrible episode of the Boxer Uprising. Even in Asia Minor, the "unspeakable Turk" has not been able to destroy enough Armenians to wipe out the societies altogether.

In South Africa I had an unusual opportunity of see-

ing how the fellowship of the Endeavorers could persist through a long and bitter war. I was in South Africa shortly before the Boer War, and attended meetings both of the Boers and British Endeavor Societies in Cape Colony, Natal, and the republics of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State. Even then the seeds of war were being sown broadcast. President Kruger and the leading Boers felt that Joseph Chamberlain, then in power in Britain, was constantly crowding them to the wall, and that they would have to fight for their liberty. The war dragged its slow length along for four years. Thousands of prisoners taken by the British, were sent to St. Helena, Ceylon and the Bermudas. In all these prison camps were many Christian Endeavorers, who found it a splendid opportunity to propagate the principles of the Society among their fellow prisoners. Scores of societies were formed in these camps, numbering in all some thousands of members. They had almost daily meetings and spirited conventions which the reasonable laws of the prison camps allowed them to attend. Some of my choicest treasures are the little Christian Endeavor pins which the prisoners in their enforced leisure whittled out of bone or stone or wood. Best of all, two hundred and fifty of these young Dutchmen volunteered for missionary service in Africa, before they left their prison camp. They have since gone into the heart of the black country, not always as evangelists or teachers, though many of them were trained for this service under the sainted Andrew Murray, but also as Christian farmers, blacksmiths and mechanics, and all carrying the genuine gospel of Jesus Christ.

Shortly after the war I was in Capetown again, and was privileged to attend the very first meeting after the war of any kind between the Boers and the British. This was a union meeting of the Dutch and English Endeavor Societies of Capetown. In the audience were many

former Boer prisoners who had just been released from St. Helena. There were also British Endeavorers who still wore the khaki, a most unlikely occasion, one would think, for a genuine fellowship meeting. But the love of Christ transcends all racial animosities. At the instance of the president of the Dutch C. E. Union of South Africa, seconded by the president of the British Union, before the meeting closed we all stood and repeated together the twenty-third psalm, each speaking in his own language. Then later, we stood again, and, in the same way, joined in the Lord's Prayer, and then, most wonderful of all, as it seemed to me, Boers and British stood once more and sang in the different tongues to the old tune of Dennis the choicest fellowship hymn in any language:

"Blest be the tie that binds
Our hearts in Christian love."

Often during the late war, this remarkable scene has come to my mind. Even in its darkest days I did not give up the hope that the love of Christ and the desire for Christian fellowship and a common service would heal the deeper wounds of the greatest conflict of the ages.

Perhaps I may be permitted to relate another incident which illustrates the same truth. This occurred in India and under very different circumstances. I enjoyed the delightful guidance of Rev. William Carey, III, the great-grandson of the noble pioneer missionary of that name, for I was visiting his field of labor in Eastern Bengal, the same field which his great-grandfather had cultivated a hundred years ago. He invited me to go to a Christian Endeavor convention in the rice country of Bengal, some two hundred miles from Calcutta.

In this region were some sixty Christian Endeavor Societies, belonging to this mission, and they were to have

a one day's convention in one of the Baptist chapels, far away from any white settlement. We journeyed one day and two nights to get there, by steamer on the Ganges, by a mission house boat, by canoe, and lastly on foot. Nothing could be more typical of Indian life, or further from the conditions under which most young people's societies flourish. But after all the spirit and purpose and even the plans discussed at this convention were little different from those I have known in thousands of similar meetings in all parts of the world.

The great subjects involved in "the pledge," of loyalty to Jesus Christ and His Church, outspoken confession of Him, Bible study and prayer and the joy and value of united effort, were discussed much as they would be in any similar gathering at home. I soon forgot the brown skins and scant costumes (more modest however, than many that we now see in America) and the strange language, for the spirit and purpose of the meetings were very familiar.

Before the meeting adjourned Dr. Carey proposed to the young people assembled that they make a "Chain of Love" for their friend from America. They seemed to enter heartily into the idea, and I was very curious to learn what a chain of love might be. First Dr. Carey called for Bible verses bearing upon the subject of love, from the young people in the audience, and the responses came thick and fast, "Walk in love," "God is love," "Love one another," "God so loved the world," etc. These verses were written down by some of the Bengali girls on different pieces of tissue paper, and were pasted together, until they made a long chain. Then a good deacon of the Church, taking off his outer garment, as a sign of respect, came forward with much grace and dignity and threw the chain over my neck, saying that he wished me to take it home with me to America, and tell the Endeavorers there that we are all one in Christ

Jesus, that each is a link in the chain of Christian fellowship, and that we must work together for our common Master.

Before this pleasant ceremony they had decked me with half a dozen garlands of flowers, according to their beautiful custom, had given me three little limes to hold in my hand, whose significance I did not understand, had sprinkled me with rose water, and rubbed the back of my hands with attar of roses, and had placed before me a dish of bananas, and some pieces of betel nut wrapped up with a little lime in some kind of an astringent leaf with which I was expected to assuage the fatigue of the meeting and of several addresses. But as can be imagined, of all the little treasured mementoes that I took from India that "Chain of Love," worthless as it was from a commercial standpoint, was the most precious of all. In imagination I have often placed it around the necks of a multitude of Endeavorers in America and other lands as a beautiful symbol of the union that binds us together one with another and with the Master of us all.

I have another association of the same sort with this noble missionary, who gave a thrilling address at the great World's Christian Endeavor Convention in Agra, India, in 1909. I quote from a report of the convention by Mrs. Clark published in *Life and Light.*

On the morning after the convention closed, at the sunrise prayer meeting on the hill, Dr. William Carey gave an eloquent and inspiring address. In the course of this address he read a part of a letter written by William Carey the First, in which he described a vision he had had of a possible gathering of missionaries of all denominations which should meet to plan together for the uplift of India. He read also an extract from a letter written by quaint old Andrew Fuller, in which the latter spoke of Dr.

Carey's "wild vision" as an impossible dream of something that could never happen, and which would not really be desirable, for, if such a company of missionaries of many denominations could ever come together in one meeting, they would be sure to disagree, and no good could result from it. Yet here we were, Methodists and Baptists, Congregationalists and Presbyterians, Lutherans, Disciples of Christ and Church of England missionaries and of many other denominations, all met together in joyful convocation, singing the Lord's songs in a strange land in many tongues, and planning together for the upbuilding of God's kingdom in all the world, and especially in India. As we sang together in the great congregation, "All hail the power of Jesus' name," we were filled with new joy and courage, and to ourselves we said,

"Like a mighty army
Moves the Church of God."

The whole convention, indeed, was an object lesson in international Christian fellowship. Four hundred missionaries had come together from all the different boards, and four thousand native Christians from India, Burmah, Ceylon, all the way from the edge of Thibet, to Tuticorin. In all the delegates spoke thirty-three different tongues. When the consecration meeting came the responses were given by languages and not by societies or unions, since there were too many of them thus to reply, but each group in its own language told what the love of Christ and the fellowship of Christians meant to them.

I cannot better close this article than by quoting a letter which Rev. Thomas Phillips, B. A., the pastor of the Bloomsbury Baptist Church of London, has recently sent to all his fellow pastors in the Metropolis. As is well known, Mr. Phillips is the eloquent pastor of the great

Baptist Church in Bloomsbury Square, the two towers of which have often proved a landmark for Americans visiting London. The word of no man carries more weight than his, and I am privileged to share his letter to London pastors with American friends.

Bloomsbury Baptist Central Church,
London, W. C.
Jan. 20, 1922.

Dear Sir,

Pardon my impertinence in writing to you to advocate the institution of a Society of Christian Endeavor in connection with your Church.

But the reason is I have been President of the London Federation during this year and have seen the rich possibilities of the movement. I am familiar with all the theoretical objections. I admit at once that the society is far from perfect. But for all practical purposes it is the best on the field. It has established itself by the law of the survival of the fittest.

It is the only society that can band together the young people of all the Churches into one united army. It crowds the Metropolitan Tabernacle on Good Friday with representatives of three hundred London societies with seven thousand members—these societies belonging to all denominations, including the Church of England. The Christian Endeavor is the reunion of the Churches on the young people's side.

It is a working society. If there is any spade work to be done, such as visiting, or open air work, the Christian Endeavorers are invariably the people that volunteer. They are the Church's engineers to prepare the way.

Intellectually it can be made what the minister or leader desires. The constitution gives the greatest possible liberty consistent with the practical purpose of the society. The leader can either form his own program, or work in unison with other societies along a well thought out plan.

What I want to see is the mobilization of all the young people of London for the creation of a city of God, and I am sure that the Christian Endeavor Society is the only possible nucleus.

Pardon me for trespassing in your vineyard.

Yours sincerely,
(Signed) Thomas Phillips.

Francis Edward Clark.

Editorial Office,
The Christian Endeavor World,
Boston, Mass.

FOR THE SPIRIT OF FREEDOM

God of freedom,
Who desirest for every man
The power to rule his own life of his own will by thy laws,
Break all chains, set free all captives,
Release into newness of self-directed search for thy will
All those who are now under bondage
Whether to other men's wills, or to their own evil will.
Reveal unto all men
That only in the resolute determination
Of a will devoted wholly to doing thy will,
And to working thy work in the world,
Is freedom to be found.

Grant a new enthusiasm for thy work,
For the upraising of the outcast,
For the feeding of the hungry, the healing of the sick,
For the deliverance of those who languish
In sore captivity to their own baser self.

Spread throughout our country
The joyful and invincible spirit of this thy freedom,
That barriers may be broken, ancient wrongs redressed,
And men of all races and tongues, of all creeds and castes,
Dwell together in mutual forbearance and coöperation,
None hindering his fellow from the attainment of that full humanity
Which is breathed upon and transfigured by the breath of the divine spirit.

—*A Book of Prayers.*

THE LAMBETH PROPOSAL FOR PRACTICAL CHURCH UNITY

In June, 1920, the bishops assembled in the Lambeth Conference took action which marks an epoch in the history of Protestantism. They sent forth an "Appeal to all Christian people" declaring their belief that "the time has come for all separate groups of Christians to agree in forgetting the things which are behind and reaching out towards the goal of a reunited Catholic Church." They further declare that "this means an adventure of good-will and still more of faith. * * * * To this adventure we are convinced that God is now calling all the members of His Church." By a single affirmation they cast aside one chief cause of offense among us;—"No one of us could possibly be taken as repudiating his past ministry." They frankly acknowledge that other ministries have been "manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace." By that significant word "effective" they pass by the controversial questions concerning the validity of other ordinations and Sacraments. They affirm, "We shall be publicly and formally seeking additional recognition of a new call to wider service in a reunited Church, and imploring for ourselves God's strength to fulfill the same."

They go still further in this way of reconciliation, and offer to do what it is often harder for us to do,—to receive as well as to give; for they add, "Terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted, bishops and clergy of our communion would willingly accept from the authorities of others a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations, as having its place in the same family life."

If our traditional adversary would thus walk with us the first mile, shall we not go with him the second mile beyond our ecclesiastical separation?

The issue cannot be evaded. The providence of God has now put this issue directly before all the Churches. The present times require action. We cannot evade the necessity of meeting this crisis if we would. For better or for worse, we must all meet it;—forwards towards a higher unity, or else we fall backwards into a deeper schism. Which shall it be? Again in this our day is fulfilled what the prophet Joel foresaw; we are come to "the valley of decision."—"Multitudes, multitudes", he said, "in the valley of decision."

The time for some determination of the Lambeth Appeal is short. Next September the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church meets. In May the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church meets. In October, 1923, the National Council of Congregational Churches meets. During this period most of the other denominations hold their general conventions. "We do not ask"—so the Lambeth Appeal leaves the issue before them all for their action—"that any one communion should consent to be absorbed in another. We do ask that all should unite in a new and great endeavor to recover and to manifest to the world the unity of the body of Christ for which He prayed." They ask for themselves as well as for all others.

Immediate practical efforts are needed. Publicity is necessary. No great movement in Church or State can succeed until it becomes a cause of the people. But as yet the Lambeth Appeal has received but little notice among the Christian Churches of this country. It has not been scattered broadcast among the people. Many of the clergy have not seen copies of it. The press has hardly taken passing notice of it. There has been little or no studious consideration of it in the local conventions of the Churches.

In England and Scotland the archbishops and other

bishops of the Church of England have personally laid it before Nonconformist bodies; moreover in accordance with a resolution passed by the Lambeth bishops, Nonconformist ministers, having the spirit of unity, have been in several instances invited to preach in the pulpits of the Church of England. Naturally we may look to the bishops of the Episcopal Church in this country to lay this Appeal before all their fellow-believers that it may have among us the utmost publicity; and we may assure them that their voices will be gladly heard by our congregations. We are not unmindful of the daily pressure upon them of their diocesan cares; but their own Rules of Order provide that the House of Bishops "may resolve itself into a Council of bishops to act on matters of duty resting upon them as a portion of the universal episcopate:" and we may therefore be pardoned for suggesting our earnest desire for them, whether individually or collectively to set this matter before all Churches throughout the land, so that the people may hear and rightly understand it.

While upon them may lie the initial duty of calling public attention to this Appeal, this does not relieve the rest of us, if we should suffer to go unheeded this opportunity for a "new adventure of faith." For as the Anglican bishops remind us, "The spiritual leadership of the Church depends upon the readiness with which each group is prepared to make sacrifices for the sake of a common fellowship, a common ministry, and a common service for the world."

For the wider dissemination and further elucidation of these proposals there are not lacking practical means for men of good-will to use. In the regular meetings of different denominational organizations, in local conferences between representatives from different communions, through public meetings and addresses, and reports in local papers, these new proposals of unity may be

made known to the people. The Federal Council of Churches also, which has done invaluable service in coöperative work, has means of bringing people into helpful conference together; and these facilities would prove helpful in the urgency of this movement for the more organic reunion of the whole Church, in which their work would not be dispensed with but rendered still more necessary and effective.

One of our Pilgrim forefathers, in the earliest confession of their faith, the Cambridge Platform, in Boston, 1648, set forth in the preface to it such ringing words as these: "It will be far from us so to divide ourselves about Church union as to open a wide gap for a deluge of Anti-Christian and profane malignity to swallow up both Church and State. Is difference about Church order become an inlet for all discords in the kingdom? Has the Lord indeed left us in such hardness of heart that Church government shall become a snare to Zion; that we cannot leave contesting and contending about it until the kingdom be destroyed? Did not the Lord Jesus, when He dedicated His sufferings to His Church, and also unto His Father, make it His earnest and only prayer for us in this world that we all might be one in Him? And is it possible that He should not have His last and solemn prayer answered?" Is this possible among us today?

Above all the discords of our history is it not the voice of the Spirit that speaketh,—"They may be one—They may be perfected into one." Is it impossible for the Churches in this day to obey the commandment of the Lord's last prayer that they may be one that our world may see its Christ?

Under an overshadowing sense of our common responsibility, the Congregational Commission on Unity have recently issued this "Call for a Covenant of Church Unity."

A CALL FOR A COVENANT OF CHURCH UNITY

At this time when the leading nations of the world are entering into a covenant of ten years for the readjustment of their military forces for the sake of keeping the peace of the world, shall not the Churches of Christ do likewise? Shall the diplomats of the world be wiser for their generation than the leaders of the Churches? At this historic hour the people throughout the Churches are waiting for some clear call to make common cause of their means and their sacrifices that we may live in a new Christian world.

Surely this is no time for tarrying in theological consultations, or standing idly within ecclesiastical limitations. Now is the time for practical agreements and united action. Our spiritual unity needs to be made so visible that the man on the street may see it.

"The way to resume is to resume."

The last National Council of the Congregational Churches, in June, 1921, expressed their belief that "the evangelization of the world rests in a united Church." The Council gave its commission on unity ample authorization to confer with any other commissions to aid in effecting this unity. A joint commission of the Episcopal and our Congregational Churches has for some time had under favorable consideration a "concordat" for common ministry in particular cases. The last Lambeth Conference of Anglican bishops, which was held in London in June, 1920, going still further in this direction, issued an Appeal to all Christian people, looking forward to a larger organic fellowship in a ministry of the whole Church. These proposals call for responsive action.

As Congregationalists we can only speak for ourselves. But that nothing may be lacking on our part, we would declare our immediate readiness to confer with repre-

sentatives of any other Churches concerning any realignments or unification of our respective forces and ministries that may be proposed. In particular, among the desirable objectives for combined action we would be willing to consider means for the following ends:

1. The fellowship of the members of any particular Church in and with the members of all other Churches.

2. The mutual recognition and utilization of the ministry of the different Churches for common needs and service in all.

3. The offering thereby of larger fields and greater incentive to enter the ministry to our young men, as well as limiting the number of ministers required for effective home service when one may be better than two or more.

4. More gradually, but possibly within the period of this ten years' covenant of peace, such consolidation or combinations of the educational institutions and their means of the different communions might be brought about as would prove advantageous for the best education and fellowship in their studies of the ministers of the different Churches.

5. And for any philanthropic, social service, mission, or federated work of the different Churches.

NEWMAN SMYTH.

New Haven, Conn.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

Regarding the rise of the various Churches and their changed attitude toward each other, President George W. Richards, Reformed Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pa., says:

One needs only inquire with an unbiased mind into the origin of the Churches and the work they have done, to free himself from bigotry and intolerance. Most of them were born in sincerity, if not always in truth. Their founders believed that they had discovered a version of the gospel and of the Christian life superior to that of any of the existing Churches. With the spirit of the prophets and of the martyrs, at great cost to themselves and their followers, they began a new Church. They not unfrequently stressed new aspects of truth, showed men in the infinite variety latent in the Scriptures, and saved the individual from the bondage of vested authority. The world and the Church are richer for Luther, Calvin, Arminius, Hubmaier, Wesley, George Fox, Campbell, and Commander Booth. In the seventeenth century men failed to see this and they *separated;* in the beginning of the twentieth century they began to see it and they *federated.*

As to faith and order, it was supposed that God had revealed a definite system of doctrine and ordained a form of government and discipline, not to speak of a mode of worship. That Church was the Church of the living God which had found the revealed doctrine and the divine order—All others must of necessity be either wilful or innocent heretics and schismatics.

Now we see clearly that neither Christ nor the apostles came to give men a system of doctrine nor a form of government but to inspire a life—a life of faith, hope and love. This life lived in the freedom of the spirit and not in the bondage of ordinances, will express itself through diverse forms, and do the work of Christ in diverse ways. The forms of the Christian life will vary with times and places, kinds of civilization and culture, heredity and temperament of groups of men. Yet each of the Churches shares in the life in a measure; none has it exclusively and absolutely. All Churches are true to Christ and themselves, to one another and to humanity, when they work together for what Christ lived and died—the Kingdom of God upon earth, which is the rule of holy love in the universe of matter and of mind in the lives of individuals and nations.

Concerning union in Scotland Sir W. Robertson Nicoll says in *The British Weekly:*

Of the movement for union between the two great Presbyterian Churches, I found only one opinion. It is being cordially supported everywhere. A

few think it too good to be true, and fear that the Scottish tendency to dispute and to split may assert itself again. But, on the whole, faith and hope are bravely at work. Those who know Scotland know what an infinite gain to religious and to social life this union will be. Unfortunately, it will be some considerable time before the change is carried through. The Churches have now to deal with pounds, shillings and pence. The old endowments have to be frankly dealt with. Some propose that the Established Church should make drastic changes. I hope, whatever happens, that life interests will be strictly preserved. If this is not done, controversies will renew themselves with the ancient bitterness.

A conference of India Christians expresses their conviction regarding the necessity of Christian unity according to *The Christian Century,* Chicago, as follows:

The Bangalore Conference, held in India the last month, considered the whole question of the unity of the native church and came to some interesting conclusions. The following resolution was passed: "That this Conference of Indian Christians consisting of members belonging to the Anglican, Wesleyan, Lutheran, Baptist, Presbyterian and Syrian denominations, is of the opinion that the several denominations of the Christian church are in all essential respects within the one church catholic, and that, in the interests of true Christian fellowship and for the extension of the kingdom of Christ in this land, a recognition of the real status of the denominations within the one body of Christ and of their ministries as of equal validity is necessary." Plans were made for a formal recognition of the ministries of the denominations, but it was explicitly stated that this should in no wise contemplate any such thing as reordination, or the repudiation of past ministries. It was agreed that all Christians should have equal access at all communion tables. The conference came to an understanding that this union should become complete and organic just as soon as the native church became independent financially. Only the denominational interests of the home churches prevent that complete union at the present moment.

The Scotsman has this to say regarding the endowment problem:

The solution suggested and approved of by both General Assemblies is that in future the endowments of the Church shall be vested in the Church under a tenure which is consistent with the liberty affirmed in the Articles, and infers no right of the State to control the exercise of this liberty in virtue of the Church's possession of these endowments.

It is recognized that the necessary readjustment in regard to this matter is a condition precedent to union, and this is the next step.

Even after this matter is settled the adjustment of all the heads and

particulars of the union of two such complicated organizations will require a great deal of consideration, and cannot be rushed through. But it is surely not too much to hope that though complete organic union may be for some time delayed, once this difficulty is removed and the question becomes one of the perhaps slow but none the less inevitable adjustment of details, the way will be at once opened up for such a federation as will give to the two Churches and to the country some at least of the advantages which union promises, and will terminate competition and its attendant dissipation of energy.

The Congregationalist, Boston, tells of Christian unity in New Zealand as follows:

In New Zealand Church union is making decided headway. Presbyterians and Congregationalists are carrying on negotiations for union. Episcopalians are more conciliatory since the Lambeth Conference and are joining in the Council of Christian Congregations in Christ Church, organized to deal with social and moral questions. Even the Roman Catholic Church has been invited to join, and is coöperating in certain ways. A New Zealand newspaper recommends a Federated Council for the whole of the Dominion.

Rev. Joseph Ernest McAfee, writing in *The Christian Century*, says:

"The first obvious thing to do about sectarianism is to cry out against it and decline to condone or apologize for it in any terms. It violates all the sanctities of democracy and of the Christian religion, the two ideals which we are loudest to-day in proclaiming.

"That is a peculiarly seductive fallacy which leads us to assume that our particular sect is better than the rest of them. When we appreciate the essentially social malignity of sectarianism we shall understand that there is no such thing as a good sect. The expression is a contradiction in terms, if our Christian democracy means anything. It may please some of us to believe that some sects, our own among them, are less bad than some others, but there is small comfort in that discovery if we are serious Christians and honest democrats. None can have part in our present religious organization and not be a sectary and his self-righteousness should not beguile him into supposing that he does not share in the social guilt which sectarianism involves.

"Into this snare many of us have fallen, are falling deeper all the time. We are so far from repentance and the fruits meet for it that we refuse to admit the malignity of sectarianism. We call it by a softer name, denominationalism, and then justify it, set forth its alleged virtues, show how naturally it grows out of human nature and even trace it to the divine ordination which makes men 'different' from one another.

"Those of us who see no religious needs beyond the entirely satis-

factory private clubs which many of our churches are, can, doubtless discover little amiss in our sectarian system. Those who observe with pride that the charitable activities of our Churches still outdo those of the secular benevolent orders both in lavish display and in comprehensive reach will perhaps be little troubled by the patronistic, undemocratic character of each and all of their programmes. If religion does not mean to us something essentially democratic, altogether brotherly, then, of course it means something else to do. Sectarianism is class-consciousness institutionalized. If that seems less than bad, then we may discover little to complain of in the sectarian order.''

The London *Times* says editorially regarding the union movement in Scotland and among the Methodists in England:

Of late years the Scottish Churches have had frequent occasion to deplore the growth of what are termed ''lapsed masses,'' especially in the great Scottish cities. The triumphant union, in 1900, of the United Presbyterian Synod with the vast majority of the Free Church has been followed by nothing else so significant as a protracted litigation over the possession of buildings and endowments, ending in legislation *ad hoc* by the civil authority, whose interference in spiritual matters both Churches had been built and endowed to resist. By the vigorous continuance of a remnant of the Free Church of Scotland, the number of religious bodies in that country is not reduced; while no such increase can be traced as was hopefully foretold in the membership of the United Free Church. It is greatly to be feared, therefore, that a precipitate union of the two Scottish Churches would result in further secessions, further litigations, while the injury thus caused to the reunited body would be enhanced by the separation from its councils of many fathers and brethren of apostolic zeal and patristic learning. These consequences, so localized as to be relatively innocuous in Scotland, would be vastly extended and magnified by premature advances towards reunion from the Church of England, in which threats of secession are now only subdued by the almost untraversed latitude of its present form of government. It is not by compression, but by expansion, that the Churches will finally unite. Their members must come to learn, of their own free will and free understanding, that man's relations with his Maker are not parti-coloured like the political divisions upon a map, but vary only in the intensity with which he apprehends them. The united Church must constitute not the highest common factor of its component sects, but a common, and that not the lowest common multiple.

From the question of the Church of England and the Church of Scotland let us turn for a moment to a consideration of the differences which divide the followers of John Wesley into three separate religious bodies —the Wesleyan Methodist, the Primitive Methodist, and the United Methodist communions. In an article which we published recently attention

was drawn to the attempt which is being made to combine them in a united Methodism for England. Though their differences, as the writer of the article remarked, might seem small to an outsider, they are in reality serious enough to make the desired reunion a matter of great difficulty. In principle, it has been substantially approved by the representatives of all three bodies; in practice, despite the efforts of the United Committee which has been studying the whole subject for the last five years, they are still unable to reconcile their divergences of opinion. The main points of difference are the respective rights, duties, and privileges of ministers and laymen, the question of the administration of the Sacraments by laymen, and the question of the body which should be responsible for the appointment, or "stationing," of ministers to Churches. Broadly speaking, most of the Wesleyan Methodist Synods appear to be opposed to the draft scheme prepared by the United Committee. They are in favour of the *status quo*, by which, in their own communion, questions of doctrine, discipline, and stationing are reserved for the ministerial session of the conference, which consists only of ministers. The majority of the other two Methodist bodies are for leaving decisions in the hands of the representative session, a mixed body of ministers and laymen, and, generally speaking, for giving certain powers to laymen both in the administration of the Sacraments and the making of appointments. In view of these still existing differences of opinion there can be little question that those are in the right who deprecate hasty action of any kind. An earnest desire for union, in response to the Lambeth Appeal, undoubtedly exists. But there is much to be said for the feeling that the time is not yet ripe for this final solution. Precipitate and premature action will not heal divisions, and might even make the last state worse than the first.

Dr. John A. Hutton writing in *The British Weekly* says:

Looking out broadly upon the world, the one thing which under God it seems to me can save us is that the Church herself shall at once get into a position in which she can speak as nearly as possible with one voice. There are those who, I repeat, think differently, who hold that there is safety in conflict of voices. They perhaps do not use the horrid phrase that "competition is the life of trade," meaning that the world gets its utmost, the utmost work, the utmost insight, the utmost revelation from men who are competing with one another for popular favour. They do not say so, but that is what is in their minds. But, and this is the deep change that is coming over the Church of Christ, we are beginning to see that the function of the Church is not to win favour with men at all, but to withstand men if need be in the name of God, in the name of that final experience and report of human existence which we have in Holy Scripture and for the truth and full implication of which our Lord laid down His life. There is, I admit, something to be said for the view that

with Churches of all kinds and creeds contending, and their public servants struggling in poverty and neglect, a certain desperate liveliness is secured. But it is not a point of view which any really kind man will take. It reminds one who knows his Carlyle of that story of a town whose streets were badly lit. In spite of complaints, the town council would do nothing. One day, however, some clever man discovered that there was a kind of moth which propagated itself abundantly in the marshes round about that town and the moth had this truly remarkable and admirable quality—when you drove a skewer through its little body that little body radiated light. The difficulty was solved. The solution seemed to be a pure providence—it was so cheap. Posts were erected up and down every street and sidewalk, and on those posts the little creatures were impaled. And, true enough, they expressed their mortal agony in light. But, as Carlyle observes, there is no report from those moths as to what they thought of the arrangement.

* * * * *

The live question to-day is not this Church or that Church. The question is Christianity or Paganism; God or Nature; the human body, the temple of the Holy Ghost, or a mere nexus of appetite and passion.

The Guardian, London, makes this note on reordination:

Under the heading "Reunion in Peril," the *Times* prints a short article from a correspondent who makes the following suggestion as a solution of the great reordination difficulty:—"The following proposal might meet both parties. Let them both submit publicly to reordination (if that unhappy term is retained) by a united act of prayer and reconsecration, and dispense on both sides with any other requirements. A most impressive united service of reconsecration could be held in Westminster Abbey and simultaneously in the Cathedrals and chief Churches throughout the whole land, which would demonstrate to the world that these great Churches and all their ministers had again been ordained by God for the work of saving the nation and mankind. All future candidates for the ministry would be ordained both by prayer and the laying-on of hands."

The Christian Century, Chicago, tells of the Eastern Orthodox Church adopting American ideals as follows:

The Greek Orthodox Church is proving itself to be much more flexible in method and more modern in spirit than the Roman Catholic Church by its recent action of establishing services in America in the English language. The downfall of the Czarist government has left the Orthodox Church quite free in countries outside of Russia to carry out reforms which have in many cases long been favored by the clergy. Archbishop Alexander Nemolosky has given orders that English shall be the preferred language

in the parochial schools in this country. In addition to this, he has given orders that civics shall be taught in these schools and every effort made to Americanize the children attending them. Such action meets much of the objection against parochial schools. If in addition to the features noted above, these schools can command teachers of a grade equal to those of the public schools, and work under a modern curriculum and method, the parochial school might even become popular. The effect of these revisions of policy upon the problem of Christian union will be considerable. There is evidently no spirit of separation in the present attitude of the Orthodox Church leaders. It is inevitable that the immigrants who come to this country should seek the familiar rites and customs of ancestral religion. It is one thing to wall off these immigrants, as the leaders of the Missouri Synod Lutherans do. It is another thing to be conscious of moving toward the goal of a catholic fellowship in the Church of Christ.

The following clipping from the *Southern Episcopalian,* November, 1859—sixty-three years ago—is interesting reading. We are moving slowly, but we are moving so that conferences and proposals in the interest of unity are multiplying. This is the clipping:

The Rev. J. W. Cracraft offered the Epiphany P. E. Church for a meeting of ministers, at nine o'clock. When we arrived at the Church, at perhaps twenty minutes after nine, we found it crowded in almost every part, with an audience of ladies and gentlemen. This, of itself, at so early an hour on a week day, was exciting. Looking around, we saw, everywhere, clergymen of all denominations, and we have been told that one hundred and fifty were present. Mr. Cracraft presided, ministers of the Churches crowding about him in and around the chancel. The Rev. Dr. Boardman, of the Presbyterian Church, (O. S.) opened the meeting with prayer; Mr. Cracraft read from the Scriptures. He then read a letter from Bishop McIlvaine, of Ohio, cordially approving the object of the meeting. Dr. Nott, for half a century President of the Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., of the Presbyterian Church, (O. S.) then rose with some assistance from Dr. Jenkins and Dr. Duffield, of Detroit—an exceedingly venerable figure, with snow white hair—and leaning on his staff, for he feels the weight of four score years, addressed to the assemblage a few words, breathing the spirit of Christian union. The chairman then called upon the venerable Dr. Humphrey, of the Congregational Church, late President of Amherst College, Mass., who responded in a similar strain, marked with much modesty as well as Christian fervor.

The Rev. W. B. Stephens, D.D., of the Episcopal Church, who as we understand from his remarks, drafted the original paper, then addressed

the meeting, stating that he had not imagined, when he wrote it in his study, that such consequences were to grow out of so simple and unobtrusive a movement. He was followed by the Rev. Albert Barnes, one of the signers of the paper, who carried forward the meeting in the same spirit. Prayer and singing were interspersed at intervals. Dr. Jenkins of the Calvary Church, Presbyterian (N. S.) made a very earnest speech as to the necessity of the manifestation of the Unity which really exists among Christians, stating among other things that there is a cure for all existing divisions.

The most interesting incident of the meeting occurred at this point, an incident, so far as we know unparalleled in the history of Protestantism. Dr. Nevin, of the Presbyterian Church, (O. S.) rose and stated that Mr. Cracraft should repeat it as the creed of the meeting, all stand- Church, and it might be of all the churches represented, and proposed that Mr. Cracraft shiuld repeat it as the creed of the meeting, all standing and joining in it. Instantly every individual of the vast assemblage sprang to his feet. The Chairman began—"I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of Heaven and earth." Every voice joined him. Nearly two thousand people—Episcopalians, Presbyterians, (Old and new School,) Seceders, Covenanters, Dutch Reformed, German Reformed, Baptists, Methodists, Lutherans, Moravians, Congregationalists, Independents—all repeated, with the simplicity of children, this grand old formula, which has come down to us on the stream of ages—"I believe in God, the Father Almighty!" Even a calm spectator, not easily excited, and standing aloof from any enthusiasm of the moment, could not but be moved. As the "Apostles' Creed," so called, is the only uninspired summary of Christian doctrine in which all these churches believe, it seems like an Act of Union of the Church Universal. It brought startlingly, and, judging from the appearance of the congregation, affectingly, to every individual the idea, so much lost sight of, that in all that is essential these Christians, cut up into what are called *sects*, are in fact one.

Addresses and prayers followed from Rev. Dr. Newton, of the Episcopal Church, the venerable Mr. Kennard, of the Baptist Church, Mr. Alfred Cookman, of the Methodist, and Mr. Taylor, of the Reformed Dutch. Mr. Cookman made the excellent remark that the points in which Evangelical Churches agree are facts, while those in which they differ are, for the most part, *theories;* and the latter made a touching allusion to the funeral of the Rev. Dudley A. Tyng, the former rector of Epiphany Church. The last speaker was Mr. Wilder, a missionary from India, who dwelt upon the interest which would be taken in this scene by the missionaries all over the world. The large assembly was then dismissed with the benediction pronounced by the Rev. John Chambers, the meeting instead of lasting an hour, having been prolonged to nearly two hours and a half.

In *The Moravian Messenger,* London, A. H. Mumford discusses the Lambeth Appeal regarding episcopal ordination and says:

We agree with our Anglican Brethren in the practice of episcopal ordination. All our ministers have been ordained by bishops, our bishops.

But the Anglicans, while admiring and respecting our efforts to maintain historic continuity through the episcopate, cannot convince themselves that our episcopate is perfectly guaranteed. They offer us their guarantees. Their bishops will consecrate our bishops, and thus, beyond all Anglican question, our episcopate will be as sound as their own.

Some of us feel a slight reluctance, or a reluctance that is more than slight, to agree to anything that may seem to reflect on our forefathers. We object to being made honest persons at the expense of their reputation.

I do not think we need have misgivings on the matter. None of us will have the slightest suspicion of our forefathers' genuineness as ministers of Christ, nor of the efficacy of the Sacraments administered by them. If any such imputation were made, and I cannot imagine any "decent" Anglican suggesting it, we should definitely repudiate it. But perhaps it removes the possibility of the misgiving if we regard the consecration of our bishops by Anglican bishops as, so to speak, an act of blood brotherhood. I grant it should be reciprocal, our bishops participating in the Consecration of Anglican bishops.

This interchange would, to many temperaments, draw the Churches closer together, and I do not see why we should hesitate to take our part in it.

On these matters I speak as a Moravian. I have never been taught to regard the episcopate as essential to the Church. The episcopate is not laid down as essential in Scripture, as transmitted grace possibly is; (but in the passage which supports this there is the explicit statement that the gift is in Timothy by the laying on of the hands of the presbyters). The word bishop means just overseer. It was taken over from the secular world, and is a practical and not a metaphysical or spiritual term.

What significance then has our episcopate? Just this: it is a bond between us and the Universal Church. When our Brethren at Lititz, after painful consideration and the drawing of lots, felt compelled to constitute themselves into a religious community, they instantly and instinctively sought to connect this community with the rest of Christendom. With this end in view they sought for episcopal ordination, and found it in the Waldensian Church. I speak as a Moravian when I say I do not consider the episcopate essential. I speak as a member of the Church of the Brethren, of the *Unitas Fratrum,* when I say that our

ancestors sought it, and our Brethren continued it, as helpful towards the unity. Now has come the opportunity of utilizing the treasured heritage. We find ourselves a little Church between two great bodies of Christians, the Anglican on the one side and the independent Churches on the other. We are freely recognized by the independent Churches, we find no difficulty there. We have an opportunity no other Church possesses of standing in the same relation to the Anglicans.

The Congregationalist, Boston, says regarding the two schools of thought in all communions:

Two schools of thought are represented in all our communions in regard to Church union and the ideal of uniting all Christian bodies in one great Church which should witness to the world the unity of the body of Christ. They found expression at the meeting of the Canadian Presbyterian General Assembly recently. A resolution was pending: "That this Assembly take such steps as may be deemed best to consummate organic union with the Methodist and Congregational Churches." It was countered by a resolution asking the Assembly to refrain from any "disturbing" action. After debate the Assembly, by a large majority, voted to go on with the measures necessary for consummation of the union of the three communions in Canada.

Significantly enough this large Canadian majority in favor of union was provided by the "prairie" country—the sparsely settled regions of the West, where three Churches in a rural center mean what three potato plants mean in a single hill—starved life for all and only small potatoes to show for any. The action of the Canadian Assembly means that the union of effort and energy for these three communions, under a common supervision, will soon be consummated, and we shall have Christians working together who have long been rivals and occasionally even enemies. So much the better for the scattered and weak churches of Canada.

The Assembly's decisive vote indicates, we believe, the trend of Christian thinking everywhere. We have not been in a hurry to bring about specific unions which have been suggested, largely because we have felt and recognized this trend of thought that works toward union like a slowly rising tide. Some channels are not navigable until the tide is in. When Christians of different names work together at the outposts, as they do more and more to-day, it is difficult for them to maintain the full importance of the inherited distinctions, or to wonder why it is necessary for them to go home for sleep and worship in different camps. But we must recognize that to-day the movement for getting together is being accelerated in different quarters. We must be alert to its consequences, both of hope and change. Congregational Churches in New Zealand, for example, have recently merged themselves wholly in Presbyterianism. Proposals or attainments of unity are signs of the times

on different mission fields. What will it mean for Methodists, for Presbyterians, for Congregationalists in the Northern United States when there is one communion, made up of the three, just across the unfortified and open border? Is it not time already to press forward in all cooperative energies and to repress all rivalries, suspicions and jealousies? For a united and successful Church of Christ in Canada, built on the union of these three bodies, will show a light of witness that cannot be hid.

The World Conference movement is making some progress. Mr. Gardiner, the secretary, sends the following:

In October, 1910, the American Episcopal Church appointed a commission to invite all the Christian communions throughout the world which confess our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour to unite in arranging for and conducting a world conference for the consideration of questions of the Faith and Order of the Church of Christ. This was done in the belief that all Christian communions are in accord in the desire to lay aside self-will and to put on the mind which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. We believe that such a conference, held in a spirit of love and humility, and in the desire to understand and appreciate the convictions of other communions, would remove many of the prejudices and much of the mutual ignorance engendered by centuries of division, and thus would prepare the way for directly constructive effort toward such a manifestation of the visible unity of Christians in the one Church, which is the Body of Christ, as will convince the world that God Incarnate in the Person of His Son offered Himself upon the Cross to redeem the world.

The commission has published and distributed all over the world nearly two million pamphlets explaining different aspects of the movement. These can be had free on application to the secretary of the Commission, Robert H. Gardiner, 174 Water Street, Gardiner, Maine, U. S. A. Seventy-five thousand letters, or more, have been received from Christians of every name in every part of the world, most of them expressing deep interest and cordial sympathy.

Before the outbreak of the war, the coöperation of practically all the English-speaking world had been secured.

So far as possible each autonomous communion of importance, which comes within the scope of the invitation, has been asked to appoint a coöperating commission. This involves some duplication, as there are commissions for the Anglican communion appointed by each of its autonomous branches, and for the Methodist, Congregational, Baptist, Presbyterian and other communions. There are now more than seventy commissions. Greatly to our regret, the Pope has, so far, declined to take part.

All Christendom has been asked each year to observe a season of special prayer for unity and for the guidance of the World Conference movement and very many reports of the observance have been received. It is recognized that the first need is for earnest and frequent prayer which shall enable us to lay aside self-will and pride of opinion and mere partisanship, so that Christians may, indeed, be able to surrender their wills entirely to God and seek the unity which He desires, and so the Christian world will be asked to continue the observance each year during the week ending with Whitsunday or Pentecost.

The Conference will meet simply for the purpose of study and discussion, without power to legislate or to adopt resolutions. Its object is that kind of conference which consists in an earnest attempt to understand one another, and every effort will be made to abandon the old spirit of controversy. It is not proposed to suggest or permit any surrender by any communion of any conviction which it holds vital. It is believed that every communion needs, for a fuller grasp of the whole truth, a thorough understanding of the convictions of other communions.

A preliminary meeting of 120 representatives of about 70 commissions coming from about 40 countries was held at Geneva, Switzerland, August 12 to 20, 1920, to uncover the root differences and to carry on the movement if it was thought worth while. Serious differences were disclosed, but all present felt that with patience and earnest prayer they could be overcome. A continuation committee was appointed, consisting of Anglicans, Armenians, Baptists, Congregationalists, Czech Brethren, Disciples of Christ, Eastern Orthodox, Friends, German Evangelical, Lutherans, Methodists, Old Catholics, Presbyterians and Reformed.

It is hoped that local conferences will be held in many places, as has lately been done in England and elsewhere with most encouraging results, for the purpose of developing that recognition of the need of prayer, that comprehension of the conference spirit and that thorough consideration of the questions discussed at Geneva which will be needed if permanent results are to be had. A report of that meeting can be had free on application to the secretary at the address given above.

From time to time the committee issues bulletins for publication of the progress made. The secretary will send these bulletins to any newspaper or magazine, secular or religious, which will ask him for them.

The Youth's Companion, Boston, asks a pertinent question:

Has Christianity failed, as the pessimists assert? It has not abandoned the field. Whatever its shortcomings may be, they are in large part attributable to the divisions among its adherents, and those divisions may not be permanent. That there may be "one fold and one Shepherd" is an aspiration of the Founder that has not yet been realized, but may it not be realized some time in the future?

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

ANCIENT ORTHODOXY IN RELATION TO THE MODERN MIND

Dr. Lhamon Replies to the Metropolitan of Nubia

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY,

Dear Sir:

I have been much interested in reading the admirable article by Nikolaos Evangelides, Metropolitan of Nubia, which appears in the last issue of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY. The spirit of the essay warms one's heart to the writer. His yearning for union is deep and genuine, and he has abundant command of the history and doctrine of his own ancient church.

But what most interests me in the essay is its efforts to harmonize ancient orthodoxy with modern requirements. The author is unconsciously naïve in his insistence on the ancient and his concessions to the modern. He insists that union must come on the orthodox basis of the Ancient Eastern Church, the dogmas of the Nicene Fathers and of the Seven Ecumenical Synods, not realizing how foreign all this is to the modern mind, or even to his own definition of a Christian, which is as follows: "A Christian, according to the mind of the Church and of religion, has the name of a believer in Christ, and does believe in Christ as by nature the Son of God, and acknowledges Him as leader of his religious and moral life. A man is not a Christian who acts according to the law of the Gospel but who does not believe in the law-giver and in God, for the doctrine and work of Christ is indissolubly bound up with his Person." How readily the Chrisian of to-day, the man of Christ with a modern mind, assents to every word of this! But how he recoils when on another page he runs squarely up against the fourth and fifth centuries in the following; "The holy Nicene Church and the dogmatic decrees of the seven great Ecumenical Synods form a divine basis, infallible and of indisputable validity. By those synods the Church of Christ, then one and united, spoke the final word on questions of faith. Any change of those doctrines constitutes not progress and completion, but perversion of the substance of the faith, pernicious and perilous innovation."

Adherence to that position bars all possible union with Christians who really live this side of Copernicus. We, who have been trained in the Baconian, or inductive method; who believe in the microscope and telescope and crucible; who have reverence for geology and botany and astronomy; whose minds have been freed from Greek speculation and Roman dogmatism, cannot assent to the assertion that finality was found by the fathers of the Greek and Roman centuries. They had their world-view; we have ours. They and their dogmas functioned for their times; our own teachings must function for our times. If the Holy Spirit wrought through them and their teachings to their good why should not the Holy Spirit work through our teachings to our good?

One may believe in the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit without going the full length of Nicene definition. He may prefer to go three centuries further back and accept the simple, concrete presentation of the Synoptic Gospels, or the more poetic and mystical but not less concrete presentation of the Fourth Gospel. The really modern mind shrinks from

definitions of the infinite. Definitions are limitations, and to limit the infinite is a contradiction in terms. As against the Nicene creed one may prefer the illimitable God who manifests His Fatherhood to us in the Brotherhood of Jesus. And besides one may wisely and humbly affirm that He attaches no definite concepts to the dogmatic categories of the Nicene creed, such as "eternal generation," and "eternal procession." Because we are not as bold in defining and limiting the illimitable God as the ancients were, are we therefore the less Christian? Are we necessarily heretical? May we not be even more "in tune with the Infinite" because we do not attempt to "tune the Infinite" down to our concepts by our inadequate phraseology? The real God may be greater than the Nicene Fathers dreamed, and if so should not the humble Christian have the liberty of believing in this greater God? May one not cry out with Robert Browning:

"God is seen God
In the star, in the stone, in the flesh, in the soul, in the clod."

I have used the Nicene creed only as an example. There is a world of ancient dogmatic delivery that does not appeal to the modern man. Indeed this modern man is very much inclined to go back on dogmatism entirely and to do his own thinking in his own way. And how could he be both intelligent and honest otherwise? And how could be be Christian without being intelligent and honest? To-day the historian, the scientist, the man of the library and the laboratory, seeks facts; collates them; and draws his own conclusions. It is only very young birds that open wide their mouths and take without question what the mother bird drops there. Our age is growing up, and mother Church must allow her adult children to use their own wings and seek their own food. If left in absolute freedom they will probably find pretty much the same food as the most ancient Church did, only they will assimilate it under different formulas. The apologist for "the old paths" may decry this as rationalism, but it is a condition that must be met wherever union is sought.

I gladly quote again from the learned Metropolitan of Nubia. "The love of Christ is surely an all-powerful bond, which nothing is able to dissolve, not affliction, want, persecution, famine, danger, the sword; but it cannot develop save in hearts which are truly religious and which lean on the arm of faith. To declare the union of Churches on a moral basis only is itself incomplete, one-sided and unfruitful, and would moreover give grounds for many dangerous conceptions." To this we, ancients and moderns, all agree. Only when we define "the arm of faith" the ancients want it in the exact and infallible form and wrappings of the Seven Synods. The moderns demand the liberty of going back of that form and those wrappings, and of seeking in the New Testament, in history, in science, their own faith and their own basis of it. The real man wants to see God with his own eyes, and feel Him with his own heart.

Truly and sincerely,

W. J. LHAMON.

Liscomb, Iowa.

BOOK REVIEWS

MOST of the prayers appearing on the pages of this number of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY are taken from *A Book of Prayers* (Written for Use in An Indian College, Published by The Challenge, London). The prayers used illustrate well the spiritual beauty of the whole collection. A brief Foreword explains the purpose of the work. "The debts owed by the writer of these Prayers to Rabindranath Tagore, and to one or two other modern authors, will be clear to anyone reading this book. The Prayers were written to express the 'searchings after God' of men belonging to several differing religious systems." It is a remarkable book. It reminds us of the close kinship, so generally forgotten, between prayer and poetry. The prayers are strong, true and simple. More especially they are "inner" and "spiritual," as well as practical. In many of them there is a mystical and semi-ascetic quality which is good for the soul. This is illustrated in the prayer entitled,

THANKS FOR SUFFERING

Lord,
We thank thee for thy loving-kindness,
Which strippeth a man naked that he may be clothed anew in thy garment of joy.
We thank thee for thy ministers, sorrow and pain,
Which leave us no refuge but thyself.
We thank thee for darkness and the horror of night,
Which force us like little children to slip our hands into thine.
Above all we thank thee for thyself
In whom our souls live and move and have their being,
Without whom they perish;
For thou alone art our eternal life,
Our never-failing treasury of love and joy,
Our Solace, our stay, our friend in life and in death.

Heralds of Passion (By Rev. Charles L. Goodell, D.D., New York, Geo. H. Doran Co.) is another moving message from the well-known pastor-evangelist, who is now the Secretary of the Commission on Evangelism and Life Service of the Federal Council of Churches in America. Dr. Goodell maintains that everything great in life is a passion, and religion being a life must be impassioned. The book comes out of the author's own heart as a word of challenge to the present hour. "I am led," he tells us, "to the choice of the stirring theme which I present because it seems to me after wide travel throughout the country

and intimate association with men in the churches and out of them, that the great need of the hour is a holy passion for the souls of men. . . I wish to bring the simple message of my Master. When He ordained Peter, He asked him no question in creed or church reform. There was only one question, so often repeated that it burned itself into Peter's soul, Lovest thou me? Among the dilettanti it is supposed be be bad form to be interested in anything. The spirit of wonder has died out. Nothing any more is grand, dominant, imperative. The glory of Wordsworth's early morning has faded into the light of common day. In some way we must get back our old enthusiasm; in some way we must find once more that passion which changed the face of the ages and sent the Church with a Pentecostal flame to carry the good tidings everywhere.''

John Ruskin, Preacher and other Essays (By Lewis H. Chrisman, Professor of English literature, West Virginia Wesleyan College, published by the Abingdon Press) is a book of interesting and illuminating essays on a number of men and things. The chapters on John Ruskin, Jonathan Edwards, and Thomas Carlyle are especially worth while. The chapter on ''The Spiritual Message and Whittier'' also leaves one better for having read it. All in all this is a book that will be much enjoyed.

A constructive word concerning the present situation in Christian unity is spoken in a little book entitled *Impasse or Opportunity?* by Malcolm Spencer, M. A., Secretary of the Student Christian Movement. The sub-title, The Situation After Lambeth, gives a clue to the author's purpose. He explains in the preface that, ''What I have written, I have written under a sense of strong constraint. It has seemed to me that the Lambeth Appeal has opened to the Church a door of great opportunity; and no one is hastening to go through. If anything I can say can open that door a little wider, I am bound to say it. I am especially debtor to the cause of Christian unity, for I have had, for a free Churchman, unique opportunities of entering intimately into the Catholic position.'' The book is a challenge to both sides and to all not to falter in the face of the difficulties which have come up in connection with the ''Appeal'' and the ''Responses'' made to it by the bodies which have considered it, but to take hold of the problem of separation and reunion with greater courage and devotion. In one chapter after another the author gives a helpful kind of ''mutual interpretation'' of the values of the creeds, orders, sacraments, and experience of religion.

Another interesting and enlightening book which has come forth to speak a word in season by way of interpretation of the Lambeth Appeal

is *Lambeth and Reunion,* by the Bishops of Peterborough, Zanzibar, and Hereford. "We have endeavored," they write in the last chapter, "in the preceding chapters to fill in some of the outlines of the Lambeth Appeal, and also to re-create the atmosphere in which it was shaped. This last is all-important, for of necessity the Appeal must be read and criticized in an atmosphere and from a standpoint very different from those in which it came to birth. Moreover, we realize how lengthy an education will be required before our own people, not to speak of others, will see it in its true setting and understand its true import." The major interest and concern of these Bishops and of their book is of course for the great cause of Christian reunion itself. "Christianity," they affirm, "can supply both the ideal way of life and the spiritual momentum by which man can attain it. But it can only be adequately supplied by the impact on the world of a united Church. Therefore the call of the world for the reunion of Christians is one whose solemnity and urgency cannot be put into words. We shall disregard it at our peril."

A book that is being eagerly looked for by Christian unity advocates is soon to appear from the press of Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, by his Grace, the Archbishop of Uppsala, Sweden. It is the second of the series under the title "Christian Unity Hand Book Series," the first volume having been "If Not a United Church—What?" which were the Reinecker Lectures at the Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary in Virginia. This volume has already passed into its second edition, which is rather unusual for Christian unity books. The forthcoming volume deals with the united life and work of Christendom. It is divided into five parts.

The first part deals with the necessity, place and reason for unity, recognizing that we know in part and therefore the approach must be by the way of unity rather than by uniformity. The second part deals with the origins of divisions—those who were put out and those who went out, also the ideals of a national church and a free church, and the divisions and alliances made by the war. Divisions may sometimes be outlets for fresh spiritual power and the distribution of gifts. The third part deals with ways to unity, which are classified as those of absorbtion, creedal and love. The Word of God and the Spirit of God transcend all organization and diplomacy. The fourth part is a short history of efforts already made toward unity and the closing section discusses the nearest aims. It is an admirable work and will take its place among the best contributions on this subject.

To merely announce this as the work of Archbishop Söderblom is of itself sufficient to awaken interest on both sides of the Atlantic, for there is no mind on the continent of Europe so devoted to the ideals of a united church and whose interpretation of those ideals is so clear, courageous and catholic. The manuscript is now being translated into English in preparation for publication in New York.

Organizations for the Promotion of Christian Unity

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Inc. Having its inception in the work of Thomas Campbell, 1809, present organization 1910, President, Rev. Peter Ainslie; Secretary, Rev. H. C. Armstrong, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. For intercessory prayer, friendly conferences and distribution of irenic literature, "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." Pentecost Sunday is the day named for special prayers for and sermons on Christian unity in all Churches.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, 1857, President, Athelstan Riley, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, London; Secretary in the United States, Rev. Galbraith Bourn Perry, Cambridge, N. Y. For intercessory prayer for the reunion of the Roman Catholic, Greek and Anglican Communions.

CHRISTIAN UNITY ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND, 1903, Secretary, Rev. Robert W. Weir, Edinburgh. For maintaining, fostering and expressing the consciousness of the underlying unity that is shared by many members of the different Churches in Scotland.

CHRISTIAN UNITY FOUNDATION, 1910, Secretary, Rev. W. C. Emhardt, Newtown, Bucks Co., Pa. For the promotion of Christian unity throughout the world by research and conference.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION, 1896, President, Prof. Percy Gardner; Hon. Secretary, Rev. C. Moxon, 3 St. George's Square, London S. W., England. For cultivation of friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian bodies.

COMMISSION ON THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, 1910, President, Rt. Rev. Charles P. Anderson; Secretary, Robert H. Gardiner, Esq., Gardiner, Me., U. S. A. For a world conference of all Christians relative to the unity of Christendom.

COUNCIL ON ORGANIC UNION, 1918, Ad Interim Committee, Chairman, Rev. W. H. Roberts, Philadelphia, Pa.; Secretary, Rev. Rufus W. Miller, Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia. For the organic union of the Evangelical Churches in the United States of America.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, 1908, President, Rev. Frank Mason North; Secretary, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22d St., New York. For the coöperation of the various Protestant Communions in service rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity.

FREE CHURCH FELLOWSHIP, 1911, Rev. Malcolm Spencer, Colue Bridge House, Rickmansworth, London, N. For the cultivation of corporate prayer and thought for a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND, 1895, President, Rev. Principal W. B. Selbie, Mansfield College, Oxford; Secretary, Rev. F. B. Meyer, Memorial Hall, E. C., London. For facilitating fraternal intercourse and coöperation among the Evangelical Free Churches in England.

WORLD ALLIANCE FOR PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES, 1914, Chairman, Most Rev. Randall Thomas Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury, Hon. Secretary, Rt. Hon. Sir Willoughby H. Dickinson, 41 Parliament St., London, S. W. 1. For joint endeavour to achieve the promotion of international friendship through the churches and the avoidance of war.

CBP

CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY
1921-1922

DATE	ISSUED TO

DEMCO